

JPRS 71944

28 September 1978

U S S R

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 11, JULY 1978

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

20000503 066

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22151. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available through Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio, 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet journal articles displaying a copyright notice and included in this report are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Further reproduction of these copyrighted journal articles is prohibited without permission from the copyright agency of the Soviet Union.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	1. Report No. JPRS 71944	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST No. 11, July 1978		5. Report Date 28 September 1978	
7. Author(s)		6.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Joint Publications Research Service 1000 North Glebe Road Arlington, Virginia 22201		8. Performing Organization Repr. No.	
		10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.	
		11. Contract/Grant No.	
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address As above		13. Type of Report & Period Covered	
		14.	
15. Supplementary Notes Translations from KOMMUNIST, theoretical journal of the CPSU Central Committee, Moscow, published 18 times a year.			
16. Abstracts The report contains articles on political, economic, military and social developments and problems within the USSR and as they relate to communist and other countries.			
17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors USSR Political Science Sociology Propaganda Economics			
17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms			
17c. COSATI Field/Group 5D, 5K, 5C			
18. Availability Statement Unlimited Availability Sold by NTIS Springfield, Virginia 22151		19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED	21. No. of Pages 157
		20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price R 8.08

28 September 1978

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 11, July 1978

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year). Where certain articles, reprinted from other Russian-language sources, are not translated, indication of this fact is made in the table of contents.

CONTENTS	PAGE
Cause of the Whole People, A Concern of All	1
My Party! Writer's Notes (M. Alekseyev)	12
Active Position of Soviet Youth in Life (B. Pastukhov)	18
Following the Course of the March 1975-July 1978 CPSU Central Committee Plenum (I. Bodyul)	33
Experience in Organizing Rural Competition (G. Zimanas)	48
Object of Great Patriotic Attention (CHELOVEK I ZAKON)	58
Historical Mission of the Working Class and the Contemporary Worker's Movement (V. Zagladin)	75
Some Problems of the Developing Countries (Ye. Primakov)	91
Futile Search (D. Gvishiani)	103
Consistent Leninist (S. Khromov)	115

CONTENTS

	PAGE
American Internationalist and Singer of the October Revolution (T. Azhgibkov)	127
Economic Functions of the Labor Collective (D. Pravdin and V. M. Kuznetsov)	139
In the Center of Practical Politics (B. Rakitskiy)	141
Short Book Reviews	145
From the Bookshelf	149

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST, No 11,
July 1978

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : July 1978

Signed to press : 26 July 1978

Copies : 979,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo "Pravda," "Kommunist."
1978

CAUSE OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE, A CONCERN OF ALL

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 78 pp 3-12

[Text] Today the Soviet people are working inspiredly on the implementation of the socioeconomic program adopted at the 25th CPSU Congress. In the first two and a half years of the 10th Five-Year Plan the national economy achieved great successes and reached a higher level in its development. New plants and factories, mines, and oil fields were commissioned. Railroads and highways were extended by thousands of kilometers and canals were built across the droughty steppes. New cities and settlements are rising in the middle of taygas and deserts.

Agriculture plays a tremendous role in the country's economic upsurge and in upgrading the people's prosperity. The all-round and highly intensive development of this sector is one of the most important conditions for building a communist society. That is precisely why the accelerated pace of the economic upsurge of kolkhozes and sovkhozes has become one of the most topical party and state tasks.

The agricultural successes achieved in recent years are the result of the systematic implementation of the Leninist agrarian policy whose beginning at the present stage was laid at the March 1965 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. Since then our countryside has covered a long way economically and socially. Resolving the strategic problem of reliably securing the country with food and industry with raw materials, the party earmarked major measures for the considerable strengthening of the material and technical base of agricultural production, above all by accelerating the pace of its mechanization and chemization, land reclamation, and comprehensive development of this important national economic sector.

The growth of capital investments in agriculture and their increased share in the overall volume of capital investments have been of great importance in the implementation of these plans. Suffice it to say that over the past 13 years the state channeled 290 billion rubles into the development of all aspects of the countryside, or three times the amount invested in the entire previous period under the Soviet system. At the same time all components of

the agroindustrial complex were being strengthened. These specialized sectors such as water resources, land reclamation, machine building for animal husbandry and feed production, rural construction, mixed fodder and microbiological industries, and others were essentially reorganized.

The amount of technical facilities available to kolkhozes and sovkhozes rose substantially as a result of such measures. Their power capacities more than doubled and their power-labor ratio rose by a 2.5 factor. Radical changes occurred in agricultural chemization. Compared with 1965 the amount of fertilizers applied today has risen by 50 million tons. Areas in irrigated and drained lands have nearly doubled, totalling 27 million hectares.

All this has had a favorable influence on the growth of labor productivity and increased output. Thus, over the past seven years, compared with a similar period before the March 1965 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the average annual of gross agricultural output rose by a factor of 1.4; grain production rose by 61.5 million tons; meat, from 9.2 to 14 million tons; milk, from 63.9 to 88.8 million tons; and eggs, by a 1.9 factor. While since 1965 the country's population increased by over 28 million the average consumption of meat and meat products per capita rose by 16 kilograms or 39 percent; of milk and dairy products by 28 percent; and eggs, by 81 percent.

The implementation of the production program was successfully combined with the solution of rural social problems. Compared with 1965 kolkhoz and sovkhoz wages doubled; extensive measures are being implemented to improve kolkhoz pensions and social insurance. Rural housing and consumer construction has assumed an unparalleled scale. Between 1965 and 1977 capital investments for rural social development have been in excess of 40 billion rubles.

As we may see, these are substantial results. However, today they can not satisfy us entirely. Major shortcomings in the output of fields and livestock farms exist in a number of oblasts, krais, and republics; production losses are allowed to occur and the economic effectiveness of the farms is growing too slowly. The plans for the first two years of the five-year plan for the overall volume of gross output as a whole and for some types of output have remained underfulfilled. Some party committees do not always profoundly penetrate into the economic and social processes occurring in the countryside and fail to realize the new possibilities for increasing agricultural output.

The problems of the further development of agriculture were submitted at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum held last July. The plenum was addressed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, Central Committee general secretary. The plenum's 4 July decree states that "the overall level of development of this vitally important sector is still behind the rapidly growing social requirements and demands energetic efforts for the further strengthening of the material and technical base of agriculture and for improving the organization of output and its effectiveness so that requirements for food and raw materials for industry be satisfied far better within the shortest possible time."

The July 1978 CPSU Central Committee Plenum earmarked the main directions to be followed in the development of agricultural production. What course should be followed in the 11th Five-Year Plan? The course tried through long practical experience will remain unchanged. The results achieved and experience gained convincingly prove the scientific substantiation and vital strength of the party's current agrarian policy. The legitimate conclusion is that the course earmarked at the March 1965 Plenum, developed at subsequent Central Committee plenums and party congresses, must be continued. This will enable us to reach new successes in the upsurge of the economy and to raise the prosperity of the Soviet people.

"The main task we assign agriculture," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the plenum, "is to achieve the all-round dynamic development of all its sectors and the reliable supply of the country with foodstuffs and agricultural raw materials in such a way that the growth of their output would ensure the further considerable upgrading of the living standard of the people. At the same time, we must multiply our efforts to resolve the problem of equalizing the material and living conditions of town and country."

On the basis of this task the CPSU Central Committee plenum stipulated that the average annual gross grain harvest to be reached between 1981 and 1985 equal 238-243 million tons, reaching an average of one ton per capita by 1990. Toward the end of the 11th Five-Year Plan the average annual meat production must reach 19.5 million tons or almost one-third above the 1977 level. The production of other commodities will be increased substantially as well. This will enable us to raise the per capita consumption of the most valuable food products and, by the end of the 11th Five-Year Plan come considerably closer to the scientific norms.

As we may see, very important objectives have been earmarked. In order to ensure their implementation the party is planning the further comprehensive strengthening of the material and technical base of agriculture, systematically converting it to industrial tracks. To this effect capital investments will continue to be increased. The decision that their share will not drop below the current level in the overall amount of funds channeled into the development of the national economy is of essential importance. At the same time, the necessary resources will be appropriated for the faster development of the other sectors of the country's agroindustrial complex. All this will create favorable conditions for production intensification and for improving the farmers' working and living conditions.

The Central Committee plenum emphasized that agricultural production intensification, based on all-round mechanization, electrification, chemization, and land reclamation, remains the basic direction to be followed by the party's agrarian policy at the present stage. The comprehensive mechanization of the growing of all most important farm crops and a maximal lowering of manual labor outlays at livestock farms will be completed in the 11th Five-Year Plan. The countryside will receive 1,870,000 tractors, 1,450,000 trucks, 600,000 grain harvesting combines, and a great deal of other equipment. The volume of output of machines and equipment for animal husbandry

and feed production will be increased substantially, totalling over 14 billion rubles. More powerful and highly productive equipment will reach fields and livestock farms.

The chemical industry will continue to increase its fertilizer deliveries to the countryside, reaching in the 11th Five-Year Plan 135-140 million tons per year. The production of feed additives and means for the protection of plants from pests and diseases and lime, particularly for the Nonchernozem Zone of the RSFSR, will increase. New major measures have been earmarked for the further expansion of irrigated areas, the draining of over-moist land, and the improvement of their utilization.

The problem of upgrading work effectiveness and quality becomes very topical under conditions of extensive production intensification and growing investments in agriculture. The party deems it necessary for all economic units, from top to bottom, to launch an adamant struggle for economy and thrift, lowering production costs, comprehensively upgrading labor productivity, and putting an end to negligence and waste. "The party's strategic slogan--struggle for effectiveness and quality," the plenum's decree notes, "must become the battle slogan of all working people in agriculture and of all workers in agriculture-related sectors."

The rational utilization of the material and technical facilities of kolkhozes and sovkhozes is of great importance to the struggle for effectiveness. The number of machines and amount of fertilizers received by the countryside is rising. However, cases of their careless treatment have not been eliminated in a number of farms. The entire country is familiar with the names of N. Bochkarev and N. Pereverzeva who achieved the highest harvesting combine productivity. Yet, in neighboring farms, output per machine unit has been considerably lower. Frequently expensive equipment, complex machines, and fertilizer are kept in the open. Fuels and lubricants are being used without proper accounting. Cases of machine cannibalizing and of violating the regulations governing equipment storage and writeoff have been found in a number of farms, in Uzbekistan for example. Not everything is well with the use of the land--the principal productive capital in agriculture. This particularly applies to the reclaimed areas. Last year Saratovskaya Oblast averaged no more than 23 quintels of grain per irrigated hectare, while a number of kolkhozes and sovkhozes along the Volga are confidently averaging 40 or more quintels per hectare. The reason for such low yields is shortcomings in water resource construction, and violations of agrotechnical rules of crop growing. These are not isolated facts. In 1977 thousands of reclaimed hectares of land in the farms of the Russian Federation were not watered once. Such practices increase production costs and harm the economic interests of kolkhozes and sovkhozes. The reasons for such shortcomings must be established and matters corrected.

The decisions of the July Central Committee Plenum offer great opportunities for the further growth of agricultural output. Priority is given to the faster development of animal husbandry. In order to implement the plans

the attention of the party organizations, ministries, departments, kolkhoz and sovkhos managers, and rural workers must be focused on increasing cattle and poultry herds and raising livestock farm productivity.

Increasing meat production is a primary task whose implementation calls for the utilization of all existing reserves. Intensive cattle feeding is a very effective method. In this respect interesting experience has been acquired by Orenburgskaya Oblast. Here inexpensive feeding grounds have been established on an interfarm basis. On a virtually year-round basis the animals are raised in the open. Costs per cattle space does not exceed 180-300 rubles, or several times lower than in livestock farms with capital construction. As a result, the cost per quintel of increased weight in some such areas is about 80 rubles. Currently the oblast has 34 such areas. Since 1974 they have raised over 400,000 head of cattle averaging 394 kilograms per head and have earned 85 million rubles. Such areas are appearing in other parts of the country. Their experience should be studied and disseminated. This will enable us to accelerate the development of the beef cattle breeding sector in the country.

In the next few years the conversion of hog breeding and meat poultry farming to an industrial base will be continued. Measures have been taken to accelerate the development of sheep and rabbit breeding and to increase the productivity of dairy farms. In the 11th Five-Year Plan the average milk production per cow in kolkhozes and sovkhos must reach 3,000 kilograms, reaching 4,000 to 5,000 kilograms in dairy areas. All this will demand of the rural workers, agricultural organs, and scientific research institutions a great deal of work related to improving cattle selection, care, and feeding, and the use of new and progressive technologies. At the same time, it is important not only to continue to set up big mechanized livestock farms and cattle feeding areas but to reconstruct more energetically existing capacities and make more effective use of available premises.

Successes in animal husbandry will be largely based on the possibilities of the fodder base. To this purpose fodder production will be developed at a specialized sector, making comprehensive use of interfarm and agroindustrial cooperation. A comprehensive program has already been formulated for the effective utilization of fodder growing land and the use of new equipment and technology in fodder procurements, storage, and feeding. As a result, the following output must be reached by 1985: Hay, up to 80 million tons; silage, 274 million tons; and haylage, 77 million tons. The production of mixed feeds and grass meal will be increased. The planning organs must efficiently plan the production of all types of feeds and ensure the necessary material and technical base for the implementation of these assignments.

Grain farming remains the shock sector in farm work. The party calls for raising grain yields to a country-wide average of 20 quintels per hectare, reaching 35-40 or more quintels in a number of grain growing areas. This

objective is entirely realistic. Already now a number of rayons averaged 20-25, or 30 quintels of grain per hectare. In 1976 the average grain crop yield for the country was 17.5 quintels. In the Northern Caucasus, the southern part of the Ukraine, Belorussia, the Baltic area, and Central Asia the collectives of thousands of brigades, kolkhozes, and sovkhozes are competing now for reaching an output of 50 quintels. Even this level is realistic. Belief in this fact rests on the reliable material and technical base, supported by extensive organizational work and the increased skill of the farmers. The experience of the leading collectives in various parts of the country who reached the highest yields must be comprehensively disseminated and made available to all rural workers. At the same time the structure of the crop land must be improved and the share of grain crops, particularly in areas with adequate moisture, must be increased.

Great attention is paid to the growing of other crops as well. Gross sugar beet harvests must be considerably raised by raising yields and applying a new technology. Target programs are being formulated to increase sunflower, cotton, potato, vegetable, and fruit yields. Great attention is being ascribed to production quality and preservation of the crops.

Production specialization and concentration, based on interfarm cooperation and agroindustrial integration, remains the main direction to be followed in the further growth of agricultural production and in upgrading its effectiveness under developed socialist conditions. Our party considers purposeful work in this direction as the most important state and all-party task, and as a new stage in the practical implementation of the Leninist cooperative plan. Currently the country already has over 8,000 interfarm and agroindustrial enterprises and associations. They account for an ever growing share of the output. Cooperation has been extended to a broad circle of production facilities and services. Interfarm livestock farms and enterprises engaged in the production of fodder, vegetables, and fruits have proved their usefulness in most rayons. For example, interesting experience has been acquired in Moldavia in the utilization of equipment on a cooperated basis. Combining forces and means is becoming ever more popular in the non-production sphere.

All this confirmed the great importance of specialization and concentration, based on interfarm cooperation and agroindustrial integration, to the upsurge of agriculture, the social development of the countryside, and the elimination of major disparities between town and country. Yet, this important socioeconomic process is still not being ubiquitously developed at the necessary pace. At a number of rayons the socialization of agricultural production and labor is taking place with unjustifiable slowness. So far the USSR Ministry of Agriculture and USSR Gosplan have not become the centers required for the coordination and direction of this work. Departmentalism is influencing the organization of interfarm enterprises. Recommendations on a number of essential problems of cooperation have not been formulated. The Central Committee plenum decree calls for "more energetic work for the development of interfarm cooperation, implementing it on a planned basis, combined with other measures for agricultural production intensification."

The plenum decisions greatly emphasize problems of kolkhoz and sovkhos economy, and production planning and incentives. Measures have been adopted and are planned aimed at improving further the purchase prices of some commodities, writing off the indebtedness of a number of farms for Gosbank loans, upgrading further minimal kolkhoz member pensions, strengthening the connection between material incentives offered rural workers and the results of their work, the effective utilization of productive capital and material resources, and others. Great attention is paid to improving economic relations with the farmers' partners. Such relations should strengthen the common interests of the state, the kolkhozes, and the immediate commodity producers, and serve as active factors in promoting the growth of labor productivity. V. I. Lenin's instruction that the proper combination of interests of all sides participating in commodity production and marketing is one of the main principles governing socialist economic management.

Socialist industry, the agroindustrial complex sectors above all, is playing an ever greater role in agricultural upsurge. In recent years a great deal has been done to develop tractor, vehicle, and other plants involved in agricultural machine building, and enterprises in the food, meat and dairy, light, and textile industries. Practical experience has indicated, however, that major shortcomings remain in the work of sectors producing capital goods for the countryside or processing agricultural raw materials. The powerful K-700 and K-701 tractors, produced by Leningrad's Kirov Plant, enjoy good reputation among the farmers. However, there is a shortage of hitched machinery for these powerful tractors, as a result of which they are operated at half capacity. Some other machine units are not produced in their full complement. The crop processing and storage base is weak. The task over the next few years is to strengthen the weak links of the agroindustrial complex. It is a question, above all, of enterprises ensuring the prompt harvesting, transportation, processing, and storage of the raw materials and of taking the finished products to the consumers.

Good traditions have developed in the country in sponsoring the countryside by cities and industrial centers. Workers and employees are dedicating all their efforts to fulfill on time kolkhoz and sovkhos orders and help in harvesting the crops. The party organizations of Moscow and Moscow Oblast, Leningrad, Sverdlovsk, Kiev, Volgograd, Minsk, and Tashkent are exemplary in this respect. Here the ties between individual industrial enterprises and kolkhozes and sovkhoses and of urban with rural rayons are being strengthened. All this contributes to the development of agriculture and to strengthening the alliance among the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry, and the intelligentsia. Particularly great deal is being done in this respect by the Moscovites. In the past seven years they have supplied the villages over 100,000 automotive vehicles, about 1,500 metal cutting machine tools, 11,000 electric motors, 80,000 pumps, and a large amount of other equipment. In the Nonchernozem areas Moscow construction work worth over 213 million rubles and completed animal husbandry premises for 55,000 head. Numerous such examples could be cited, deserving support and dissemination. Everyone should be concerned with the upsurge of agriculture. The Soviet people clearly realize that increasing the output of fields and livestock

farms depends, to a tremendous extent, on the urban residents, on those who smelt the metal, produce the machines, supply fertilizer, and process the raw materials.

Currently the results of the CPSU Central Committee July Plenum are being discussed at party committee plenums, by aktivs, and at meetings of primary party organizations. The plenum decisions have met with the widest possible approval and support of the party and the people. The successful implementation of the program for the development of agriculture would be inconceivable without the reliable work of the party organizations and the active efforts of the rural party members, the sectors within the country's agro-industrial complex, and the scientific research institutions. Today they are a huge combat capable army of active fighters for the building of communism. Currently the countryside alone numbers 5.8 million party members, or 1.2 million more than in 1965. 2.7 million party members and candidate members are directly employed in fields, livestock farms, and other basic sectors. Unquestionably, they can resolve the complex and extensive problems of kolkhoz and sovkhos economic upsurge and further production intensification. The systematic implementation of the party's agrarian policy depends on the adamant and purposeful work of the party members.

The party organizations must focus their main attention on the strict implementation of plans, upgrading the productivity of fields and livestock farms, enhancing work effectiveness and quality, and ensuring the comprehensive utilization of reserves. As in the past, substantial financial and material and technical resources will be channeled to the countryside. We must be concerned with the efficient investment of such funds and with their highest possible returns in each kolkhoz, sovkhos, rayon, oblast, or kray. A great deal must be done to reduce further production losses. The bottlenecks in the development of the production process must be established and the channels through which crop losses are incurred must be found and blocked in each kolkhoz and sovkhos, interfarm and agroindustrial enterprise and association, with the active help of agronomists, zootechnicians, engineers, economic services, and scientists. It is important for the party committees and all party members to develop in the collectives a creative atmosphere of search, comprehensively supporting the initiative of the people, and act as Leninist zealous fighters for the new, and display their intolerance of negligence.

Work with cadres has been, and remains, the key problem of the party's management of agriculture. The party considers this work an inseparable component of its agrarian policy. Under the Soviet system talented organizers of kolkhoz-sovkhos production, field and livestock farm innovators, true creators, and masters of their work have been nurtured. The country is well familiar with the names T. Mal'tsev, A. Gorshkov, A. Gitalov, M. Klepikov, N. Pereverzev, L. Peyps, T. Akhunova, V. Rudenko, and hundreds of other outstanding workers. Today 4,225,000 mechanizers and 1.6 million specialists are working in the countryside. Their size and skills are growing steadily. Good work is being done in Rostovskaya Oblast, for

example. Here nearly all farms are headed by people with higher and secondary specialized training. A great deal has been done to strengthen secondary level cadres. Universal mechanizer training has been extensively developed along the Don: Three hundred and forty thousand people will be trained in the course of the 10th Five-Year Plan. Many such examples could be cited. This work has been properly organized in Moscow, Donetskaya, and Kirovogradskaya oblasts, and in Moldavia, Belorussia, and Lithuania.

However, an acute shortage of cadres, mechanizers in particular, continues to be felt in a number of rayons. In the Armenian kolkhozes and sovkhozes, for example, there are 81 tractor drivers per 100 tractors; there are 96 in Azerbaydzhan, 104 in Georgia, and 116 in Kazakhstan. A similar situation may be noted in several other areas as well. This means that at harvest time many machines idle or are used undereffectively and partially. The party organizations must correct this situation and increase their attention to the training of cadres and keeping the young people in the villages. Greater attention must be paid to improving working and living conditions, for it is no secret that many farms are still not making full use of appropriate funds for the building of service stations and workshops. A great deal must be done to improve housing, the construction of consumer projects, and the development of cultural and public education institutions in the villages. "Today," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out at the July Plenum, "the question may be phrased only thus: Farm managers, party committees, and soviet and trade union organs must display equal concern for the development of output as for satisfying the housing and living requirements and increased cultural demands of the rural working people."

The urgent task of the party organizations is to engage in the extensive promotion of the documents of the Central Committee plenum in a militant way, using all means of party influence, bringing their meaning and significance to the minds and hearts of all Soviet citizens. A great deal remains to be done by the propaganda and mass information organs as well. They must contribute to the profound interpretation by the party members and all Soviet people of the essence of the party's agrarian policy at the present stage. The leading topic of the press, television, and radio must be the extensive coverage of the organizational, party-political, and ideological and educational work of the rural party members, and improvements in the style and methods of the party's management of the kolkhoz and sovkhoz economy. Attention, as in the past, must be focused on the struggle waged by the working people for the accelerated development and increased effectiveness of all agricultural sectors, upgrading the pace of agricultural mechanization, chemization, land reclamation, crop yields, and livestock farm productivity.

The July CPSU Central Committee Plenum earmarked the main directions in the development of agricultural production in the future. The implementation of the great program will be the easier the more successfully the rural workers and the other units within the agroindustrial complex implement the tasks of the 10th Five-Year Plan. That is why the assignment of the party,

Komsomol, and trade union organizations and of all rural workers is to focus their efforts on the implementation of the 1978 plan and the five-year plan as a whole. This particularly applies to the collectives of kol-khozes and sovkhozes and interfarm and agroindustrial enterprises and associations which, by virtue of a variety of reasons, have been unable to cope with the work, have obtained slight production increases, or have even lowered volumes of output. Party committees, farm managers and specialists, and agricultural organs must thoroughly study the reasons for such lagging, earmark specific measures to improve the work, and assign personal responsibility for tasks. Lack of organization or lengthy stirring up should not be allowed. "The output shortages which developed in the first two years of the five-year plan," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the July plenum, "must be replenished. We must ensure the strict implementation of the assignments formulated at the 25th CPSU Congress."

Today good prerequisites exist to achieve this. As a result of the successful implementation of the sowing campaign and proper care for the plants, a good crop has ripened in many parts of the country. It is important to harvest it quickly and preserve the grain, and tuber and root crops. Following the grain growers of Central Asia the farmers of the Northern Caucasus, the Ukraine, and other areas have begun harvesting. The cereal growers are pleased with the output and are confident that the harvest would be good. On the eve of the harvest the farmers of the Gigant Grain Sovkhoz, Rostov, which recently celebrated its 50th anniversary, launched a valuable initiative. They adopted new higher socialist obligations: To harvest 35 quintels per hectare and sell the state no less than 60,000 tons of high quality grain, or 21,000 tons above the planned figure, and to overfulfill their assignments for the first three years of the five-year plan for the sale of grain, meat, milk, sunflower, and vegetables.

"Your high obligations," noted Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in his letter to the Gigant collective, "are a clear example of the concern displayed by the Soviet people for the interests of their state. I believe that your experience will become widespread and your noble initiative will meet with the support of all kolkhozes and sovkhozes, rayons, oblasts, krays, and republics." Inspired by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's letter, the grain sovkhoz workers fulfilled their socialist pledges.

The initiative of the Gigant Sovkhoz grain growers has been adopted throughout the countryside. Inspired by the party's concern for the further upsurge of agriculture, crop growers, livestock breeders, and all rural workers are fully resolved to spare no efforts for having a successful harvest and for fulfilling and overfulfilling their planned obligations for the third year of the five-year plan. For example, the Kuban' grain growers have assumed new higher obligations. They have pledged to deliver to the elevators, in the third year of the five-year plan 4,350,000 tons of grain more than previously planned. No less than two billion tons of winter wheat grain of the highest quality will be poured in the granaries of the homeland. High level output has been pledged also by the grain growers of the Ukraine, Volgogradskaya and Saratovskaya oblasts, the Central Chernozem and Kazakhstan, the cotton growers of Uzbekistan, and the livestock breeders of Belorussia, the Baltic Republics, and other parts of the country.

The implementation of the plans and obligations greatly depends on the skillful organization work of party committees. It is their duty extensively to develop the socialist competition, and assume unabated control over the implementation of the tasks set themselves by the collectives of kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other enterprises within the agroindustrial complex. Particular concern should be displayed for good preparations for the harvesting campaign, the skillful deployment of cadres and other forces and facilities, and the fast and high quality harvesting of the crops in the remaining unharvested areas. It would be expedient to this effect to make use of the experience of the masters of the fields in the southern granaries of the country who have already completed the cereal harvest. Now the rural workers must thrash the grain crops in the most difficult areas: In the Urals, the RSFSR Nonchernozem, Northern Kazakhstan, and a number of areas in Siberia and the Far East. Also remaining is the harvesting of sugar beets, cotton, potatoes, and other food and industrial crops. They are particularly labor intensive and the task of kolkhoz and sovkhoz mechanizers, repair workers of the Sel'khoztekhnika associations, the processing enterprises, and the suppliers of material and technical resources is to ensure the prompt supply of the farms with spare parts and fuel, tune up the harvesting equipment and transportation facilities, and prepare the storing areas. The output in which the tremendous toil of peasants and workers has been invested should not be allowed to go to waste or lose consumer qualities.

Today there is no more important task facing the rural workers than the successful completion of field operations and ensuring reliable supplies of fodder and preparing the livestock farms for wintering. Furthermore, the farmers must lay the solid foundations of the next harvest and create prerequisites for the further growth of production effectiveness.

"As we have frequently pointed out," emphasized Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the July CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "agricultural upsurge is a matter for the whole people, a common concern." Unquestionably, under the leadership of the Communist Party and its Leninist Central Committee, workers, peasants, agro- and zootechnicians, engineering-technical, and scientific workers, and the working people of town and country will successfully implement the program for the further development of agriculture. This will be a major contribution to the implementation of the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and in the gradual conversion from socialism to communism in our country.

5003
CSO: 1802

MY PARTY! WRITER'S NOTES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 78 pp 13-17

[Article by Hero of Socialist Labor Mikhail Alekseyev]

[Text] "I am a communist!" These words, strung one after the other, are very precious to me. I see behind them familiar and unfamiliar faces, yet all identically brave and honest. Some of them, silently, accepted a martyred death, carrying these words in their hearts. Others hurled them like a hand grenade at their torturers. Others again, remembering these enobling words, assumed incredibly difficult burdens: They were the first to attack the withering enemy fire, suddenly becoming fiery speakers at critical times, when the passionate word of the communist was extremely needed by the people confused in most complex matters and when the problem of problems was being resolved: What side of the barricade to stand on.

Yet, there was a time when communism was considered merely a ghost roaming around Europe, frightening the exploiters but, nevertheless, no more than a ghost. However, as the son of history, it conquered the human minds and hearts and assumed a material force. Seventy-five years ago, at the Second RSDWP Congress, it assumed its flesh and blood within a party, through Lenin's will, mind, incredible energy, and tremendous efforts, a party which, leading the people, expelled from and destroyed over one-sixth of the globe the most inhuman system which had built its palaces and temples on the blood of the people. It is frightening to think that, century after century, millions and hundreds of millions of people whose hands have built everything valuable on earth have remained essentially alone. Everyone for himself! Yet, opposing them, the working people, was the organized and powerful capitalist army. That is precisely why they were defenseless in their poverty and rightlessness. They could be sent to the slaughter of a war like a herd of sheep, a war which was promoted by the powerful who had been deprived of their "piece of fat"; forced to work in mines and plants to exhaustion for a pauper's pay or, sometimes, for no pay at all. If you objected you were executed without trial or investigation or else left to rot in forced labor, for in the proud word of "worker" the oppressors would only see a "slave" which, over the centuries, had given them the right to order you around and control your fate.

Today these dark and sinister times are for us a matter of the past. Today the working man has become the master of his land and his destiny, for he found support and protection in the Communist Party. Therefore, the loneliness of the working people came to an end. It is for a reason that the enslavers lost their calm the moment the word "communist" appeared and became reality, acquiring a dynamic force terrifying the enemies of everything honest on earth. Today this word can neither be suppressed nor eliminated, for the highest title of communist is borne by people armed with Marxism-Leninism, and with the passionate belief that their cause is just and, therefore, invincible. Time itself dictated the historical necessity of the appearance of communist and workers' parties.

"I am a communist!" I see people who have pronounced these sacred and inspired words with shining eyes. They include you, my comrade in the battles for Stalingrad, Petya Akhtyrko, the young political instructor, who recommended my application as party member, a fearless soldier who was terribly excited when I was being accepted as member of the VKP(b) in a nameless gully protecting the soldiers from shrapnels. During those fiery years the following leaflet was stuck in the cards of the new party members: "To the party member all work at the front is honorable and important. Earn attention and respect not by virtue of your position but through your work . . . the communist is the first to join the battle and the last to leave it, proving that the communist can not only live nobly but die with dignity."

"I am a communist!" This could be said with equal pride by a person with whom I share the same family name, the political organizer of the second infantry company, who was the first to rise in the hot Don Steppe and lead people his age against the attacking enemy. He did not survive the battle but will remain forever remembered by his friends. "Consider me a communist," wrote before the battle the 20 year old rosy cheeked and rather shy boy who hurled himself under a fascist tank with a cluster of hand grenades. Also communists were those who inspired the young guards to commit their immortal exploit and those who organized a Bolshevik underground wherever it seemed as though no one could organize it--in the Hitlerite jails and concentration camps . . .

All these people thought of their rights least of all and always remembered their obligations. Actually, to them rights and obligations were the same. They accomplished and are accomplishing great exploits as commanded by their hearts and their obligations as party members. Among all human rights the communists place higher than all the right to be ahead, in other words, the right to be wherever it is most dangerous and most difficult, wherever the zealous heart of the fighter is necessary. It was on the basis of this noble right that the young communist Yuri Gagarin, whose name is now to us bright like the sun, was the first to fly in outer space, opening for mankind a path to new worlds beyond the earth's gravity.

Army Bolsheviks. When I think of them, I see, one after the other, Dimitriy Furmanov, with the irrefutable logic of his words and communist convictions cooling off the excessively temperamental Chapay; Sergo Ordzhonikidze, commissar extraordinary; Leonid Brezhnev, chief of the political department of the 18th Army, whom the defenders of the small bridgehead at Novorossiysk saw in their ranks in the most difficult moments; the company party organizer or rank and file soldier-party member, who was the first to spring out of the trench at the Kursk Arc, to meet the enemy face to face; the anonymous squad or company agitator who, in free times, read to the soldiers in the Leninist room "How the Steel Was Tempered" . . . all of them were communists, examples of individual bravery and courage, human responsiveness, and high humanism.

Such was the case during the war. Such is the case today as well, in days of peace, in the struggle for our beautiful future. As a former soldier I dedicated my first books to the army communists. However, I perfectly remember and know that many of them, immediately after their demobilization, took their excited and warm words to other fronts, where the battle for rebuilding the economy destroyed by the war was being mounted ever more extensively and intensively, for erecting the most beautiful building known as communism. This battle has been described already today by one of its active participants, Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and head of our state, in his outstanding book "Vozrozhdeniye" [Rebirth].

I could start a long list of party members--heroes of our peaceful days, those whom I know personally and have met and befriended at different times and in different circumstances. They would include Vasilii Mitriyevich Postnikov, the famous steel smelter from Elektrostal'; Fedor Trofimovich Morgun, who abandoned, in his time, a rather high position in the Poltava area and went to the snow covered and now legendary virgin lands to create there the first sovkhoz, from scratch; Sergey Ivanovich Zhilenko, from Zavety Il'ich, who slightly over 10 years ago assumed the management of one of the most backward kolkhozes and, within an impossibly short time, turned it into a leading kolkhoz not only in the oblast but throughout the country. Today Sergey Ivanovich and his fellow villagers could proudly say about themselves: Yes, we live in Savety Il'ich, following Il'ich's legacy! How numerous are the young party members who are now working at the Baykal-Amur Main Line, this truly greatest construction project of the century, and at many other shock construction projects scattered around our vast land! Accepting the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress, not only with their minds but with their hearts, they are leading the numberless detachments of peaceful fighters. The party soldiers are people with a clear conscience, creators and builders. A person who has become a member of the Communist Party, thus assuming a greater share of responsibility to society, derives greater satisfaction from life itself: He knows that his life is very needed to other people. Could there be any greater happiness on earth!

Everywhere
Where tracer bullets meet
Where selfless toil is very hard
From one century
To another
Forever
To the end:
Communists, forward! Communists forward!

"I am a communist!" The tracer bullets cross not only in war. The communist must fight a continuous battle in peace time as well on another front--the ideological front--when our enemies greatly rely on subversion through words. As a literary worker, i.e., as a person belonging to the creative intelligentsia, in the course of my trips beyond the socialist comity (like my fellow writers) I am most frequently attacked by the same ad noseam boring formula: "No freedom to create exists or could exist in the Soviet Union."

With your permission, we tell them, is it conceivable that with a lack of creative freedom Soviet art could give the world durable spiritual values such as M. Sholokhov's "Tikhiy Don" [And Quiet Flows the Don] and "Podnyataya Tselina" [Virgin Land Upturned]; A. Fadeyev's "Razgrom" [Defeat]; N. Ostrovskiy's "Kak Zakalyalas' Stal'" [How the Steel Was Tempered]; A. Serafimovich's "Zheleznyy Potok" [The Iron Stream]; L. Leonov's "Sot'" [A Hundredth] and "Russkiy Les" [Russian Forest]; K. Trennev's "Lyubov' Yarovaya"; K. Fedin's "Goroda i Gody" [Cities and Years]; Vs. Ivanov's "Bronepoyezd 14-69" [Armored Train 14-69]; Vs. Vishnevskiy's "Optimisticheskaya Tragediya" [Optimistic Tragedy]; A. Tvardovskiy's "Vasiliy Terkin" and "Za Dal'yu-Dal'" [Far and Far Away]; M. Isakovskiy's poetry; Ye. Isayev's "Sud Pamyati" [Judgment of the Memory], or Yuriy Bondarev's "Bereg" [Shore]? What about the literatures of peoples which, prior to the October Revolution, lacked even an alphabet and which now have proclaimed their spiritual power through the ringing and universally heard voices of Chingiz Aytmatov, Rasul Gamzatov, Kaysyn Kuliyev, Alim Keshokov, David Kugul'tinov, Yuriy Rytkheu, or Ivan Shestalov? Are all those literatures not the offspring of the Soviet system? . . . Could the unparalleled Bol'shoi Theater, unique and all conquering exist and develop? What about the Moscow Academic Art Theater? What about the Leningrad Opera and Drama Theater? What about the theaters and ensembles of the Ukraine, Belorussia, Georgia, Uzbekistan, Moldavia, the Baltic Republics, of all our fraternal Soviet socialist republics, who are performing throughout the world with invariable triumph? Could they have been born and blossomed without freedom? . . .

It might seem useless to go on citing endless proof of obvious truths. Nevertheless, I assume that, occasionally, an explanation is needed. This is necessary perhaps for the fact alone that, like the waves of the sea, human generations, replacing each other, are rolling along our old planet and, like streams flowing toward big rivers and, in the final account, to the sea, looking for the truth. Where is this truth? There is no person on earth who has not spoken or thought of freedom.

What is freedom? How to understand it? Does it exist as an absolute?

This last question is particularly important, for there does not seem to be any other concept about which so many opinions have clashed, so much explosive material accumulated, so many human big and petty passions exploded, and so frequently used for both noble and speculative purposes.

Freedom . . . so, what does it mean? Without plunging into strictly theoretical considerations, let me express a few things self-evident from the viewpoint of ordinary common sense. Let us begin with the fact that it is not within the power of an individual to decide whether to appear on this world or not. The moment he is born he is wrapped in diapers by the nurse and, for a while, he can move neither arms nor legs. What kind of freedom is this? The moment he grows up somewhat he is immediately surrounded by a large number of seemingly fabricated conventions. It is not enough for a person to be forbidden from insulting the dignity of those around him. He is also required to study, to burden himself with the boring need to acquire some kind of skills or knowledge, whereas he would like to run along in the streets and play games. As he grows further, he suddenly realizes that the category "you can not" is just as common as the category "you can." We are not free from a number of useful rules and behavioral norms developed by the people in the course of millennia in order to bring order to their affairs and common life on earth. If you commit a prejudicial action from the viewpoint of the human community you are now strictly and sternly asked: "Do you or do you not have a conscience?" It appears that every person must have a conscience! Yet, a conscience is nothing but one of the most rigid limitations of willfulness. In some circumstances, people commonly say: "My conscience would not allow me to do so." If they praise someone they say, "he is conscientious." I believe that this is the proper time and place to recall the Bolshevik Party, in Lenin's noteworthy words, is "the mind, honor, and conscience of our epoch." As we may see, the word "conscience" is found here in the same line with other significant words and, with them, carries a tremendous social, political, and moral weight. This is because man, as we know, can not be without convictions. He professes and can not fail to profess ideas. That is why I loudly proclaim that I am a man and I am not free from my own convictions and ideas. These are communist ideas which have brought and are bringing to millions of degraded, insulted, exploited, and oppressed people a long awaited real freedom. I am particularly proud of such views, for they have been acquired at the cost of a struggle and through spiritual maturity. My views and convictions as a literary worker offer me infinite freedom and clarity in the choice of artistic means to defend and praise the cause for the sake of which so much blood has been shed by the working people, and the will, joys, and suffering which I experience and for the sake of which the great Lenin created the revolutionary party of the working class.

The artist, if he is truly an artist, even in the darkest and seemingly hopeless times, has never tired to suggest to the people the thought of the possibility of a better life on earth, the possibility to live a different life, more worthy of man. Suggesting this thought, through the light of his mind he searched in the darkness of time tomorrow's hero.

The search was not easy for entirely obvious reasons. Try to find your ideal among the mass of forgotten, almost totally illiterate people, maimed by different prejudices. Look at a time when your own search was not simply not encouraged but, on the contrary, blocked cruelly and mercilessly. Remember the fate of A. Radishchev, N. Chernyshevskiy, A. Gertsen, or T. Shechenko . . . the reason was that the aspirations of the artist not only did not blend with the aspirations of the rulers but opposed them. You, the artist, would have wanted to awaken in the "debased and insulted" slave the proud freedom-loving man. Yet, it suited the ruler that the slave remain a slave forever, for it is only under such circumstances, as though frozen forever, the slave would be unable to weaken the foundations of autocracy.

Centuries passed but the conflict between the artist and the ruler remained. Such was the case with my fatherland as well until October 1917 when Lenin's party set as its main objective that of raising an entirely new man, the man about whom the leading artist of previous centuries had dreamed.

For the first time in the life of mankind a historical blending occurred of state and, under our circumstances, also party interests with the interests of progressive and revolutionary art which became in name and, above all, in its essence, socialist. The search for the new man and the struggle for him, for his education, was jointly taken up by the party and the artists who dedicated themselves entirely to serving the people. The hymns created, for example, by Vladimir Mayakovskiy in honor of the Revolution and its offspring--the new man--could have come only from the very depths of heart, joyfully excited and widely opened to the new. That is why the voice of the singer was so fresh, pure, and transparent. That is why he dedicated to the attacking class the entire hundred volumes of his party cards.

A fighting creative man made his presence felt as he entered the world. It is the revolutionary duty, the need, and the greatest happiness of the Soviet artist to welcome this man with songs, to enhance him, to make him visible to all and from all vantage points. It was the party created three-quarters of a century ago by the great Lenin that gave us this fullness in the experience of life and the happiness of creativity. Belonging to it is the subject of my greatest pride.

5003

CSO: 1802

ACTIVE POSITION OF SOVIET YOUTH IN LIFE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 78 pp 18-29

[Article by B. Pastukhov, Komsomol Central Committee first secretary]

[Text] Lenin's party proceeds from the fact that the living cause of the building of communism demands the increased social activity and initiative of all working people, including the youth. Such is the objective law of socialism in general and of developed socialism in particular. The political guidance of the young generation and the involvement of adolescents in conscious participation in the building of communism is accomplished by the party largely through the Komsomol, relying on it as on its reliable assistant and reserve.

Today the young generation enters life with exceptional opportunities for all-round and harmonious development and constructive creative activity. The party comprehensively supports and develops the labor and socio-political activeness of the young builders of communism.

A clear scientific program for the upbringing of the youth at the present stage, the new areas for the application of the forces of the country's youth in the front of the building of communism, and the role and place of the Komsomol in the party's revolutionary-transforming activities are stipulated in the greetings of the CPSU Central Committee to the 18th Komsomol Congress and the speech delivered at the congress by Comrade Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, the wise and concerned tutor of Soviet youth, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman. The implementation of the tasks set by the party for the Komsomol members, and all young men and women offers a broad field for displaying the active vital position of the youth of the Soviet state and the shaping within it of communist conscientiousness and the readiness, will, and ability to build communism.

The all-round development of the individual is impossible without his self-assertion in work. It is only from work, said V. Sukhomlinskiy, the outstanding Soviet educator, "that stem the solid threads leading to the intellectual, moral, esthetic, emotional, and physical development and establishment of the ideological and civic foundations of the individual."

Dedicated and creative toil is also the most important manifestation of an active position in life and a practical university in which the character is strengthened and the civic qualities of the individual are molded. In this case socialist competition plays an invaluable role. It is the most vivid manifestation of a conscientious attitude toward labor on the part of the broadest possible toiling strata.

Together with the party members the members of the Komsomol are the inspiring and organizing force in the struggle for the implementation of the 10th Five-Year Plan. Over 20 million young men and women are involved in the movement for a communist attitude toward labor alone.

V. Golubeva completed her training at a vocational technical school at the age of 17 and took up her place behind a machine tool at the Ivanovo Worsted Combine imeni V. I. Lenin. She learned from famous weavers and worked inspiredly, with total dedication. Skill and public recognition came. In one and a half years Valentina fulfilled a five-year assignment and is struggling for fulfilling by 1980 two more individual five-year plans. Working caliber of this young innovator shows the date 1983. V. Golubeva, laureate of the Leninist Komsomol Prize, set an all-union weaving record and was made Hero of Socialist Labor.

Such are the people--many similar examples could be cited--of which our party, the Leninist Komsomol, and the entire Soviet people are proud.

The Soviet young men and women are actively participating in the all-union socialist competition and in the patriotic movement of "Youth Enthusiasm and Creativity for a Five-Year Plan of Effectiveness and Quality!" The movement was initiated by the workers of the automotive plant imeni Likhachev. Its main objective is to promote the labor activeness and creative initiative of the masses.

From the very first days of the 10th Five-Year Plan the initiators of this movement--the ZIL workers--have maintained an efficient work rhythm and ensured the fulfillment and overfulfillment of plans and socialist obligations by every worker and specialist, and by the Komsomol-youth collective. In the first two years of the five-year plan the young automotive plant innovators have applied over 3,000 rationalization suggestions and 11 inventions saving over 1.5 million rubles. The young specialists are working under the slogan of "Engineering Support for the Worker's Initiative." The creative cooperation between workers and specialists is aimed at the effective utilization of production reserves, upgrading the quality and durability of output, and metal economy. At the suggestion of worker Yuriy Bobykin, the collective of the complex creative brigade of the press plant of the ZIL amended the technological process for metal cutting as a result of which 47 tons of rolled metal are saved every year. The creative search of the young people in casting made it possible to save substantial amounts of metal and to increase labor productivity 25-30 percent.

The movement for a communist attitude toward labor has become widespread among the ZIL young men and women. Today over 12,000 communist labor shock workers are at work here and over 11,000 are struggling to earn this honor title. One out of three Komsomol-youth collectives has been awarded a title of "Communist Labor Collective."

A total of 2,500 young men and women and 34 Komsomol-youth brigades reported the ahead-of-schedule fulfillment of Komsomol of two-year plans; 48 Komsomol-youth collectives and 3,000 young men and women took higher socialist pledges to fulfill the plans for the first three years of the five-year plan by the first anniversary of the adoption of the new USSR Constitution; the Komsomol-youth shift of the vehicle assembly plant (D. Katseba, chief of shift) pledged to assemble from the beginning of 1978 to the date of the 60th anniversary of the Leninist Komsomol 580 ZIL-130 motor vehicles above the plan.

The 25th Party Congress gave priority to upgrading social production effectiveness and labor quality. The Komsomol increased its sponsorship over the production of high quality goods and preparations for its certification for the state Emblem of Quality. The experience of the working people in L'vovskaya Oblast in developing and applying a comprehensive quality control system has become widespread among Komsomol-youth collectives.

Addressing the Komsomol Congress, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev reemphasized the problems of effectiveness and quality, stressing that this was not a temporary campaign but the long-term party course--the key task of our economic and social development for many years ahead. This is also a program for raising an entire generation of Soviet people. The party expects of the Komsomol initiative, new undertakings, and long-term activities, mounted along the entire front and depth, aimed at upgrading the effectiveness of the national economy and the quality of the work.

Capital construction, and the development of our country's natural resources are the most important sectors of Komsomol activities. Direct involvement in all matters related to economic development is the party's honorable and responsible assignment.

The Komsomol's sponsorship of capital construction and of strengthening the material and technical base of our society has a rich history. It steadily developed and covered the distance from Komsomol participation in the building of individual projects to sponsoring the development of the leading national economic sectors; from the establishment of individual shock brigades to the mass social call of young people to new construction projects; from the organization of Komsomol control over the work at individual industrial sites to the establishment of a widespread network of Komsomol staffs and "Komsomol Beacon" posts; from the application of individual technical innovations to systematic struggle for the acceleration of scientific and technical progress; from saving on some scarce materials to cost accounting and universal economic training; and from single youth brigades to Komsomol-youth managements and trusts.

In the current 10th Five-Year Plan 140 of the biggest new construction sites in the country are all-union shock Komsomol projects. It would be difficult to find a construction project in Siberia, the Far East, Kazakhstan, or the North where representatives of the Komsomol are not at work. There are over four million young men and women in the ranks of construction workers, 1.4 million among whom are Komsomol members. Essentially, in our country building is a young people's profession. For example, the average age of the workers engaged in the building of such major projects as the Baykal-Amur Main Line, the Kama Automotive Plant, or Atom mash, or the development of the petroleum and gas deposits in Western Siberia or the Bratsk-Ust'-Ilim Territorial-Production Complex is 23-25 years.

Youth passes on sponsorship over the development of the power industry from generation to generation: From the first "Il'ich bulbs"--the Kashira and Volkhov power plants--to power generating "suns" as the Bratsk or Krasnoyarsk GES. Today one out of four Komsomol construction projects is related to power industry and electrification. Participation in the development of a nuclear power industry is a new stage in our shock work. Komsomol members and young people are making a great contribution to the building of the Baykal-Amur Main Line. All party and government assignments related to its construction are carried out ahead of schedule and with good quality. A total of 1,100 kilometers, or one-third of the tracks, have been laid; a number of one-of-a-kind bridges and tunnels, and a network of highways have been built; 46 settlements have been established. The Komsomol-youth brigades, collectives, administrations, construction-assembly trains, and two Komsomol-youth trusts are militantly developing the petroleum and gas deposits of Western Siberia. In Tyumenskaya Oblast alone 13 of the most important construction projects are all-union shock projects to which 100,000 young men and women were given Komsomol assignments.

Each of the all-union shock construction projects is not only a site where the young people apply their efforts, energy, and enthusiasm, but a labor training school. The all-union shock construction project offers broad scope for creative search and for the growth of the young person.

New major accomplishments await Komsomol members in Siberia and the Far East, particularly in the development of the petroleum and gas industries of the Zapadno-Sibirskiy Territorial-Production Complex. At the Komsomol Congress Comrade L. I. Brezhnev described the growing importance to the Soviet economy of this tremendous construction project, and to the present and future of our homeland, facing the Komsomol with practical tasks in developing the natural resources of Siberia and the Far East. The congress decided to assume sponsorship over assignments related to such areas and direct there the necessary number of skilled cadres. The first volunteers from Moscow, Leningrad, all union republics, and the krais and oblasts of the Russian Federation, members of the all-union shock Komsomol detachment imeni XVIII Komsomol Congress, went to the construction project to lay the beginning of a new Komsomol labor epic.

Together with the economic managers, the Komsomol committees and staffs of the shock construction projects must ensure the creation of favorable conditions for the work, training, life, and recreation of the young construction workers. The comprehensive solution of these problems will help to keep the young people in the newly developed areas.

The Komsomol and the entire Soviet youth welcomed with great patriotic enthusiasm Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's speech at the July 1978 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the plenum's decree "On the further Development of USSR Agriculture." The young rural workers are comprehensively expressing their unanimous aspiration successfully to implement the party's tasks. They are focusing their efforts on the utilization of additional possibilities for production growth so that in the third year of the five-year plan they may grow and harvest a rich crop and give the homeland greater output from fields and livestock farms.

Implementing the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and the decree of the party's July Central Committee Plenum on the further upsurge of agriculture, the Leninist Komsomol is directing the efforts of the rural young men and women to the struggle for the all-round upgrading of farming standards and the growth of livestock breeding productivity. It is participating in the specialization and concentration of agricultural production, and land chemization and reclamation. It concerns itself with upgrading the technical knowledge of rural youth.

Presently about four million Komsomol members are engaged in agricultural production. Most of them are skilled workers: Agronomists, engineers, zootechnicians, mechanizers, and skilled animal husbandrymen. Today the situation in the villages can not be actively influenced without profound knowledge and high professional skills. In the past 10 years the number of Komsomol members-agricultural specialists has increased by a factor of 2.5; that of mechanizers, by a 1.8 factor; and that of animal husbandrymen, by a 1.5 factor.

An educated and trained generation has come to the fields and livestock farms.

The Komsomol organizations are struggling for high farming standards and high grain and other farm crops. Most of the rural youth, nearly one million mechanizers-Komsomol members, and 55,000 Komsomol-youth collectives are engaged in farming. They are armed with modern equipment and extensive professional knowledge and with the experience of those who have dedicated many years to the difficult but honorable work of grain growing.

The Komsomol organizations of the Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Belorussia, and Georgia are comprehensively sponsoring the cultivation of the most important farm crops. They have launched a campaign for high production quality. The movement was initiated by the young Kuban' farmers who are working under the slogan of "Each Komsomol Field in the Kuban' with the Highest Crops."

Participation in the development of public animal husbandry has become another shock project of the rural Komsomol. In recent years the Komsomol has sponsored the building of 1,500 livestock breeding complexes, and 500 poultry farms and feed production enterprises.

Implementing the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Measures for the further Development of Agriculture in the Nonchernozem Zone of the RSFSR," the country's Komsomol organizations assigned, on a voluntary basis, over 58,000 young men and women to Nonchernozem projects. Over 60,000 young workers from industrial enterprises participated in the work of shock detachments at target projects. Every year 160,000 members of student construction detachments go to work in the Nonchernozem Zone. Through their efforts, in the course of three labor semesters, over one billion rubles' worth of capital investments were used, and hundreds of socio-cultural consumer and industrial projects were completed. Presently about 150,000 young men and women and 1,500 Komsomol-youth collectives are working at the decisive sectors of rural and reclamation construction in the Nonchernozem area. The patriotic initiative of the graduates of rural schools in Kostromskaya Oblast is a vivid manifestation of an active position in life, warm interest in the upsurge of their native area, and understanding of the most important state tasks. They decided to link their lives to the noble work of grain growers, animal husbandrymen, and construction workers, join the great ranks of rural workers, and continue their best traditions.

The movement of "If You Live in the Village Know Your Equipment!" was highly rated by the party. The technical training of rural young men and women, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized, must become a truly mass movement. He called upon the young people, the Komsomol, to become the main motive force in promoting beneficial changes in the countryside, use the new equipment, build the modern countryside, and promote high culture.

The party's course toward the solution of problems directly related to upgrading the prosperity of the Soviet people demands of the Komsomol active participation in improving the work of light industry, trade, and consumer services enterprises. The Komsomol organizations have already done a great deal in this respect. However, as Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted at the Komsomol Congress, many shortcomings remain here. The Komsomol must assume permanent and unabated sponsorship over consumer services.

Today the thrifty and rational utilization of all the country's resources, of anything produced by the national economy, remains one of the main reserves for the acceleration of economic development. The use of this reserve, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized at the December 1977 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, is a key task. This party stipulation coincides with V. I. Lenin's thought that communism begins with the manifestation of dedication which surmounts hard work, and with the concern of the rank and file workers for raising labor productivity and preserving each pood of grain, coal, iron, and other products.

The responsibility of Komsomol committees and primary Komsomol organizations for economy and thrift is growing. Every Komsomol member must actively participate in the all-union public review of the utilization of raw materials, materials, and fuel and energy resources sponsored by the AUCCTU, Komsomol Central Committee, and USSR Gosnab. The "Komsomol Beacon" must prove itself with new strength in this matter.

An aspiration toward search and toward the fullest blossoming of the individual with all his capabilities and talents, and the noble wish to dedicate all creative forces to the service of society are mandatory qualities included in the concept of an active position in life. The movement for youth scientific and technical creativity offers extensive opportunities for their revelation. Interesting and promising methods to develop this movement have been elaborated, such as scientific and technical creativity detachments, complex rationalization brigades, staffs and posts for the application of new equipment and progressive technology, voluntary creative associations, and progressive experience courses.

Reviews and exhibits of scientific and technical creativity by the youth have become a widespread method for involving the young generation in the struggle for further scientific and technical progress, and a lever for the fastest possible utilization of inventions and rationalization suggestions. Two million people participated in the first all-union review of youth scientific and technical creativity, dedicated to the 50th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. In the year marking the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution 15 million young men and women participated in scientific and technical creativity; currently, their number has reached 17.5 million.

Shaping an active position in life by the youth means raising the young men and women in a spirit of communist idea-mindedness, Soviet patriotism, proletarian internationalism, and high level organization and discipline. It means purposefully disseminating among the young people the achievements and advantages of the socialist system, seeing to it that every young person become an active builder of the new society.

The Komsomol's loyalty to the party and to the Marxist-Leninist doctrine under whose banner the Great October Socialist Revolution won and all historical victories of socialism were gained, has always been, is, and will remain the most important prerequisite and guarantee for success in the building of communism. Conviction based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and revolutionary passion are powerful weapons in the struggle for communism.

A scientific outlook is a necessary base for ideological convictions. Shaping it is the most important task of the entire process of upbringing.

Youth interest in the study of revolutionary theory and the works of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, the materials of party congresses, the works of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, and the party's theoretical and practical activities is

rising steadily. Extensive Komsomol heroic-patriotic readings of "Malaya Zemlya" and "Vozrozhdeniye" [Rebirth], by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, are taking place. These outstanding works have become real textbooks of life for the new generation. An efficient system for youth Marxist-Leninist education has been developed in the country, to whose improvement and development the party organizations pay particular attention. As we know, the foundations of a scientific outlook are laid in the schools, in vocational-technical schools, and in secondary specialized and higher educational institutions. The role of secondary schools in training ideologically convinced and highly educated young builders of communism rises sharply under the conditions of universal secondary education of the youth.

The extra-curricular activities of school Komsomol organizations, saturated with a deep socio-political content, contribute to the ideological and political education of the youth. Today virtually every school has museums of the combat glory of the Soviet people, Lenin halls, and circles for the study of Lenin's life and activities. Participating in "The USSR--My Homeland" expeditions, millions of secondary school children are exposed to the exploits of the elder generations. Every year all-union reviews of students' compositions are held. In 1977 over 10 million secondary school and vocational-technical school students presented compositions on "Our Biography," dedicated to the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution.

Yet, the Komsomol organizations must pay greater attention to the further advancement of political information in the schools. They must make more extensive use in their educational work with highschool students of debates, conferences, and question and answer evenings. The creation of rayon lecture cycles on politics, economics, culture, and the international situation, first developed in Dnepropetrovskaya Oblast, for the benefit of highschool seniors, is interesting and should be disseminated.

The VUZ Komsomol committees are actively participating in sponsoring competitions of works on social sciences, history of the Komsomol and the international youth movement, agitation marches by student youth, young lecturer courses, and social profession faculties.

The VUZ Komsomol tries to organize its work in such a way that the future Soviet specialist would not only become an ideologically convinced person but an active and able promoter of communist ideas and party policy, possessing the skills of mass-political and agitation-propaganda work.

Resolving problems of communist education, the Komsomol committees do not forget even for a minute that the outlook of our young people is shaped under the circumstances of a drastically aggravated ideological struggle between the capitalist and socialist worlds, and that the broad peaceful offensive mounted by our party and country demands the all-round strengthening of ideological tempering and active confrontation with bourgeois ideology.

Enemy propaganda is trying to detect any crack through which to penetrate inside our country. It is trying to promote among the young people the poisonous seeds of political indifference, nationalism, and a bourgeois and private ownership morality, and weaken its position in life. We realize that the struggle in this field must be active, aggressive, and concrete. Neutralism and compromise has not place in the clash between the two outlooks. This calls for high political vigilance, operativeness, convincing propaganda work, and prompt rebuff of ideological subversions.

The patriotic and international upbringing of the youth is the most important direction of our activities. Internationalism is an inseparable feature of the socialist way of life. It imbues the entire practice of the Communist Party and the Leninist Komsomol.

The very history of our homeland and the revolutionary, combat, and labor traditions of the Leninist party and Soviet people are a great educational force without which it would be inconceivable to develop the noble qualities of citizen, patriot, and fighter. Our young people draw their communist convictions, passion and persistence in reaching the planned targets in the heroic past and present of the socialist fatherland.

The efforts to raise the young generation in the spirit of the great traditions has acquired a broad scope. It has acquired a deeper content and a vivid and emotional aspect. The all-union trips by Komsomol members and young people to sites of revolutionary, combat, and labor glory of the Soviet people have become an important socio-political movement for mastering the comprehensive experience of their fathers.

The further improvement of this mass patriotic movement requires the more specific participation in it of all interested organizations.

The next stage in this march will take place in 1978-1980. It is dedicated to the 60th anniversary of the Leninist Komsomol and the 110th anniversary of V. I. Lenin's birth. The Komsomol Central Committee has assigned the Komsomol committees the task of comprehensively improving the education of the young people in the heroic traditions of the party, the people, and the Komsomol, and in the example of the leader's life and activities.

We shall continue to develop the traditions of the Timurov movement, the sponsorship by Komsomol and pioneer members of construction and socialism veterans and families of dead soldiers, for the activeness of the position in life is determined above all through action--through the ability and desire to be useful to the people and society.

The defense of the socialist homeland is the cause of the entire people, and every young Soviet person considers his military duty, codified in the USSR Constitution and legislation, an honorary civic duty.

The gains of socialism are sacred to the Soviet youth. At the first call of the Communist Party they are ready to take up the defense of their fatherland.

Party and Komsomol members account for the majority of the personnel of military units and navy ships; 60 percent of squad commanders and 20 percent of company commanders are Komsomol members. Today one out of three army and navy Komsomol members is rated excellent in combat and political training; one out of two is a higher grade specialist; the majority have mastered complex skills and are graded athletes. Using Komsomol ways and means of organization, the Komsomol sees to it that every young soldier feels personally responsible for the defense capability of the Soviet state, utilizes the training period, tries to meet the combat work norms, and displays initiative and creativity.

Currently socialist competition has been launched in the army and navy under the slogan of "Reliably Defend the Socialist Fatherland, Maintain a State of Constant Combat Readiness, Adamantly Master Weapons and Equipment, and Perfect Combat Skills."

Important tasks face the military Komsomol organizations. They must participate even more energetically in strengthening the combat readiness of the Soviet armed forces and increase the vigilance of the young troops in terms of aggressive imperialist intrigues.

A patriotic education is inseparable from concern for the preservation of historical and cultural monuments. A socialist attitude toward the sacred objects of the fatherland is now reflected in the USSR Constitution and the task of the Komsomol organizations is comprehensively to contribute to the exercise of this constitutional stipulation.

An active position in life presumes the full manifestation of the best moral qualities of the individual. Under the party's leadership the Leninist Komsomol is raising the young people in the spirit of communist morality which has inherited and is developing the best humanistic norms of morality elaborated by mankind and the revolutionary workers' movement.

Under the Soviet system the most progressive and humane system of moral norms and social values was developed in the country; an outstanding atmosphere of creative toil and trust in people has been established. It was pointed out at the 25th CPSU Congress that the Soviet person is the most important result of the past 60 years. Having withstood all trials, he has changed unrecognizably, combining within himself ideological conviction and tremendous vital energy, culture, knowledge, and the ability to put them to practical use. The loyal sons and daughters of the Leninist party have always been, and will remain, moral examples to all generations of our youth.

Mature socialism creates particularly favorable conditions for the molding of an all-round developed and highly moral individual. Our young people truly embody the best qualities of the people of a new, socialist type, displaying in their daily affairs a greatness of spirit, ideological convictions, and moral firmness.

The Komsomol raises the Soviet youth in a spirit of dedicated service to the homeland and honest fulfillment of civic duty. The best features of the young generation of the 1970's are manifested in loyal service to their people, conscientious attitude toward labor, organization, and discipline. The Komsomol organizations are extensively promoting the moral upbringing of young men and women, developing in their characters industriousness, honesty, discipline, comradeship, and awareness of their own dignity.

Unfortunately, a number of collectives have still not eliminated violations of discipline and public order, and various types of anti-social actions. Those trapped by narrow and egotistical interests and petty bourgeois concepts have not converted yet. There still are young people who try to take more from society than they give it, who think only of rights while forgetting obligations. Yet, material goods are not a self-seeking aim but a prerequisite for the development of the individual. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev drew the attention of the Komsomol to the need to increase the struggle against all deviations from the norms of socialist morality--drunkenness, hooliganism, labor discipline violations, indifference, cynicism, and parasitism.

The moral positions of a person are also manifested in the extent to which he is careful in his attitude toward nature and the extent to which he contributes to the preservation and multiplication of its resources. Ecological training and education of the young people in the rational utilization of natural resources is a realm of activities of the Komsomol organizations as well.

We can clearly see today how under conditions of developed socialism K. Marx's brilliant prediction to the effect that leisure time is a yardstick of social wealth is being fulfilled: In the Soviet society it is "promoting" the development of a harmonious personality. This includes time spent in studies, social activities, physical culture, sports, and technical and artistic creativity.

With every passing year our state broadens the network of cultural and educational institutions, developing mass sports and tourism, and concerning itself with the creation of real possibilities for the young citizens to apply their creative forces, talents, and capabilities. The young people use extensively such socio-cultural benefits.

Our entire way of life and the ideological and educational work of the party, the state, and the social organizations direct the young person not only to the consumption of cultural goods but to actively participating in the development of the spiritual potential of the Soviet society. Work in literary-creative associations and art studios, and participation in festivals, competitions, and other forms of creativity have become mass phenomena among the youth.

Today there is no area of artistic creativity in which the voice of the young is not heard loudly. The CPSU Central Committee decree "On Work with the Creative Youth" is imbued with fatherly concern for the future of our literature and art. In cooperation with the creative unions the Komsomol Central Committee elaborated and is implementing measures aimed at the active involvement of young literary workers, painters, and composers in the creation of highly artistic works. Youth commissions have been set up by each creative union.

Yet, here again a great deal remains to be accomplished. We notice occasionally a gap between youth interests and requirements and the ways and means of work demanded of young people by cultural institutions. The Komsomol organizations themselves are not always interested in the way the young people use their opportunities for creative growth or what it is that determines the range of their interests. The neglect displayed by Komsomol committees and cultural institutions toward the repertoire of actor ensembles and the ideological and artistic content of some undertakings leads to the penetration of elements of tastelessness among the young people. Yet, every Komsomol member must gain a clear understanding of the ethical significance of beauty and develop an immunity to artistic forgeries, and intolerance of ugliness. The combination of what is intelligent, ideological, and truly beautiful gives an invincible power to the active position in life of the young builder of communism.

Understanding the particular role of recreation in youth upbringing calls for emphasizing amateur mass activities in the fields of education, rest, and entertainment. Naturally, in principle, the professional leisure time organizers, with their experience and feeling of responsibility, can organize on a high level evenings, lectures, celebrations, trips, and hikes. However, the young people should not be kept in the position of passive consumers. Their own initiatives, ideas, fervor, combined with responsibility, can enrich both the forms and content of this useful project.

The Komsomol organizations face extensive work in developing rural culture. Using the opportunities offered by the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Measures for the further Improvement of Cultural Services to the Rural Population," the Komsomol must take a new and decisive step in enriching the spiritual life of rural young men and women and in their harmonious development.

The noble task of each Komsomol organization, for whose implementation we rely on the interested attention and support of party organs, is to develop the movement of young culture soldiers, which appeared several years ago in Moscow Oblast and proved to be quite effective.

From the very beginning of the Soviet system the party gave the Komsomol the task of upgrading the industriousness of young men and women, temper their health and willpower, and actively involve them in physical culture and sports. The Komsomol is doing everything possible to convert the Soviet physical culture movement from mass to nationwide.

Under the party's leadership, together with the trade unions and the physical culture and other state and public organizations, the Komsomol sponsors mass Spartakiades, tournaments, competitions for prizes offered by heroes of the Great Patriotic War, labor, and sports, and various cross country and relay races. Every year as many as 70 million young people participate in such events.

The active position in life of Soviet youth is expressed also in the fact that the young men and women of the Soviet state directly influence themselves all social and governmental affairs in the country. They participate in the administration of the first state of the whole people in the world. Socialism has offered youth all possibilities for extensive socio-political activities.

The content of Komsomol work has deepened under mature socialist conditions. The initiative of Komsomol members and young people have been developed substantially. The interaction between the Komsomol and soviet and state organs and other public organizations has become comprehensive and richer.

The new USSR Constitution (Article Seven in particular) stipulates that, in accordance with its statutory tasks, the Komsomol shall participate in the administration of governmental and social affairs and in the solution of political, economic, and socio-cultural problems. Article 51 of the constitution guarantees the Komsomol conditions for the successful implementation of these tasks.

Under the party's guidance the Komsomol has acquired very rich experience in participating in state, economic, and cultural construction and in conducting ideological and political work among the youth. The participation of its members in the activities of soviets and state and economic organs and other public organizations within the political system of the developed socialist society is expanding steadily.

The important stipulation reflected in the USSR Constitution of granting the right to elect and be elected as of the age of 18, and the right to be elected to the supreme legislative organ of the country--the USSR Supreme Soviet--as of the age of 21 is a factual manifestation of the high trust in youth. This stipulation entrusts the young generation with even greater civic responsibility, offering it new opportunities for participation in the administration of societal and governmental affairs.

Over one million Komsomol members are participating in the work of people's control organs, and nearly as many are members of trade union committees. Young people account for approximately one-third of the membership of enterprise social administration organs. Four million young men and women are taking management training through the "Komsomol Beacon" which, essentially, represents a mass economic management school.

As a rule, the soviets of people's deputies, ministries, departments, trade unions, and other public organizations consider problems of youth education, upbringing, vocational training, work, and living and recreation conditions

with the Komsomol committees. The Komsomol committees daily cooperate with trade union and economic organs in resolving problems related to the hiring and layoff of young people, bonuses to young workers, kolkhoz members, and employees, the labor safety of adolescents, the allocation of housing and places in dormitories, and the spending of funds appropriated for mass cultural and sports work.

The establishment of permanent deputy commissions in charge of youth affairs within the USSR Supreme Soviet, the supreme soviets of union and autonomous republics, and the local soviets of people's deputies, with which the Komsomol interacts extensively, was of great importance. The work of these commissions is most directly related to the all-round upbringing of the young people and the molding of their active position in life.

Also promising is the establishment of permanent commissions for youth affairs at ministries and departments. Such commissions have proved their usefulness at the ministries of machine building for animal husbandry and fodder production, petroleum refining and petrochemical industry, tractor and agricultural machine building, and chemical industry. They exert noticeable influence on matters of organizing the socialist competition among young workers, training workers replacements and upgrading their skills, ensuring housing to young men and women, and the entire process of training young sectorial cadres.

The formulation and adoption of joint decrees by Komsomol and state organs on problems of youth labor, living conditions, recreation, and training has become widespread.

Instructive experience in combining the efforts of the Komsomol, the various ministries and departments, and the public organizations and creative unions has been acquired in Uzbekistan. Here a comprehensive long-term plan of work with the youth in the republic has been formulated, whose implementation is controlled by the Communist Party of Uzbekistan Central Committee. This has led to the development of an integrated systemic approach to the solution of all youth problems. Such deep interest and coordinated actions have yielded beneficial results.

According to Article 113 of the constitution, the Leninist Komsomol, represented by the Komsomol Central Committee, was given the right to initiate legislation in the USSR Supreme Soviet. This is yet another proof of the great trust shown the Komsomol by our party and Soviet state.

No single generation of Soviet youth has enjoyed such broad factual opportunities to display its capabilities and talents in all fields of human activities as the present one.

To the Komsomol, and to every Komsomol member, and all young men and women the year 1978 will be marked by a major event: In October the Leninist Komsomol will celebrate its 60th anniversary. "The Komsomol's age," noted

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "is that of a full adult. However, its spirit is always young. The Leninist Komsomol is the party's battle aid and reliable reserve." The Komsomol owes anything significant acquired in the course of 60 years of life and all its durable wealth to the daily concern and attentive and sensitive guidance of the CPSU. The party painstakingly shares with it its organizational and political experience, ideological firmness and moral principles, encouraging its initiative and activity, nurturing and bringing up youth leaders, and strengthening the party nucleus within the Komsomol.

The Leninist Komsomol and the Soviet youth are dedicating all their efforts, knowledge, and enthusiasm to the successful implementation of the great party plans, loyal always and in everything to the cause of Lenin and communism!

5003

CSO: 1802

FOLLOWING THE COURSE OF THE MARCH 1975-JULY 1978 CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE PLENUMS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 78 pp 30-43

[Article by I. Bodyul, Communist Party of Moldavia Central Committee first secretary]

[Text] Agrarian problems play an important role in the comprehensive program for the socioeconomic development of Soviet society, systematically implemented by the CPSU. "The main task we assign agriculture," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the July 1978 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "is to promote the all-round and dynamic development of all its sectors, and the reliable supply of the country with food products and agricultural raw materials in such a way that the growth of their output would ensure a further considerable enhancement of the living standards of the people. At the same time, we must multiply our efforts for the equalization of the material and cultural-living conditions of town and country." The reaching of these objectives presumes the development of agricultural production always on the level of the achievements of scientific and technical progress with the type of available technical and economic possibilities which would enable us to ensure not only the highly effective functioning of production forces and the socially necessary sectorial productivity but the all-round social progress in the countryside.

The Soviet Countryside at the Stage of Quality Changes

The contemporary agrarian policy elaborated at the March 1965 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and developed at subsequent Central Committee plenums and party congresses represents a qualitatively new stage in the implementation of the Leninist strategy and tactics in the field of agriculture. This policy is based on mature socialism and is aimed at the further development of the kolkhoz-sovkhoz system as the first foundation for the socioeconomic progress of the Soviet countryside.

The CPSU program stipulates that "in terms of production relations, nature of labor, level of prosperity and culture of the working people, the Soviet kolkhozes and sovkhozes will become, to an ever greater extent, communist

type enterprises." This theoretical stipulation formulated by the party on the basis of the summation of the practical experience in building a new society, reflect the objective laws governing the further development of production forces and the improvement of social relations in the course of the transition from socialism to communism. It is the starting point for the elaboration and implementation of corresponding practical measures.

The party formulated a comprehensive long-term program for material-technical, economic, organizational, and social measures for the all-round upsurge of agriculture. "We are realists," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the 25th CPSU Congress. "We well know that the qualitative reorganization of agricultural production will demand time, work, and huge investments."

The production-economic base and social prerequisites for the solution of the new great problems were provided by the farsighted CPSU policy, the entire course of socialist changes in our country, the successful development of kolkhozes and sovkhozes, and the scientific and technical revolution. Under developed socialist conditions the country's agrarian sector has entered a period of highly dynamic growth. This is specifically manifested in the fast increase in productive capital, above all through powerful and progressive equipment capable of ensuring the comprehensive mechanization of nearly all labor operations, the automation of some of them, the electrification of many production processes, the considerable growth of the power-labor ratio in agriculture, extensive land reclamation, chemization, and other actions implemented with great scope and persistence. The pace and scales of implementation of this direction of the CPSU's agrarian policy are confirmed by the fact that in the course of the 8th, 9th, and first two years of the 10th Five-Year Plans state and kolkhoz capital investments in agriculture have exceeded 250 billion rubles. This accounts for over 70 percent of the capital investments in this sector throughout the entire Soviet system.

Important economic measures for the stimulation of agricultural output were formulated at the March and subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums. their implementation enabled the farms to increase their accumulations and channel greater funds to the renovation and modernization of productive capital, the creation and expansion of new sectors, and the increase of wage and socio-cultural funds. Between 1965 and 1976 payments to kolkhozes, sovkhozes, other state farms, and the country's population for produce sold rose from 32.3 billion rubles to 73.4 billion, or by a 2.2 factor. Whereas in 1965 the volume of kolkhoz capital investments was 4.9 billion rubles, it rose to 11.3 billion in 1977 even though the number of farms within that period declined 25 percent. Kolkhoz and sovkhoz wages per work man/day rose by a 1.8 factor.

The CPSU agrarian policy is aimed at raising the living standard and improving the working condition of the rural workers, and gradually equalizing the income of kolkhoz members and earnings of workers in state agricultural enterprises, equalizing the social consumption funds distributed among those

employed in industry and other material production areas and agriculture. The purpose of such an equalization and of making wages consistent with the changed nature of agricultural labor and its higher socioeconomic significance is to contribute to the proper distribution of manpower resources in the national economy and their planned utilization.

The practical implementation of the party's course of developing the production forces in the countryside is closely linked with the solution of the social problems. In the time following the March 1965 CPSU Central Committee Plenum a conversion was accomplished from the labor day to the guaranteed cash wage in the kolkhozes; the wages of sovkhos workers were raised; pensions to kolkhoz members were introduced; the training-production base of VUZ's, technical schools, vocational-technical schools training agricultural cadres was broadened. The share of capital investments appropriated by the state and the kolkhozes for the building of schools, hospitals, cultural clubs, libraries, stores, consumer services combines, children's institutions, sports centers, roads, water mains, settlement electrification and gassification, and other residential objectives rose considerably.

The qualitative changes in rural production forces demanded, in turn, the improvement of production relations and the intensification of the processes of labor socialization and division. In the initial stages of the development of the kolkhoz-sovkhos system, production concentration was accompanied by the specialization of major zones and areas in the country. At that time a multi-sectorial farm was the most typical and expedient structure of kolkhoz and sovkhos public production. This structure stemmed from the condition of production forces and the experience then available in collective farm management.

Under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution and the conversion of many crop and animal husbandry sectors to an industrial base favorable conditions were created for the intensification of public production through greater concentration and more developed specialization. Actively assisting the development of such possibilities, the party pointed out the ripe need for conversion from multi-sectorial to specialized production based on machine technology and scientific organization of labor and management. The theoretical substantiation of such scientific recommendations and practical measures for their implementation were expressed in the CPSU Central Committee decree "On the further Development of Specialization and Concentration of Agricultural Production on the Basis of Interfarm Cooperation and Agroindustrial Integration" (1976).

"Production specialization and concentration, i.e., that which Marxists-Leninists describe as the further socialization of socialist production and labor," emphasized Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the July CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "is an adamant requirement of reality, one of the decisive foundations for our programs."

The successful development of the progressive economic system in the countryside, extensive production cooperation, direct merger of agriculture with industry and science with production, and exceptionally important economic and social consequences of such profound processes provide all the necessary grounds for the conclusion that the country's agrarian sector has entered a period of new revolutionary changes in production structures, conversion to specialized output, and radical improvements of organizational forms and economic relations. The main result of all this has been the accelerated pace of agricultural output and its improved quality and increased volume of procurements and a substantial improvement of labor productivity and the prosperity of rural workers.

Convincing data on increased yields and output of all farm products, public herds, and livestock productivity were cited at the July 1978 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. Compared with the average annual level in the Seventh Five-Year Plan, Moldavian gross agricultural output rose by an average of 76 percent in the first two years of the 10th Five-Year Plan, rising 83 percent in the public sector. Sectorial intensiveness per 100 hectares of farmland rose by a 1.8 factor. Labor productivity in agriculture rose 65 percent. However, the dynamics of such indicators achieved by the republic are considerably below the rate of increase of productive capital and of the power-labor ratio which rose, respectively, within the same period, by factors of 4.2 and 3.2.

It was noted at the plenum that Moldavia produced less goods than planned for the first two years of the five-year plan. Naturally, the republic's party organization will draw from this criticism the proper conclusions and dedicate all efforts to make full use of the tremendous opportunities for the accelerated growth of agricultural production and for increasing its effectiveness.

The most important directions followed in the nationwide struggle for a steady agricultural upsurge were considered at the plenum profoundly and comprehensively. After a study of the achieved results and acquired experience, convincingly confirming the vital force of its agrarian policy, the party proclaimed its resolve to follow the course started with the March 1965 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. Going further under present conditions means comprehensively upgrading the level and effectiveness of agricultural production, systematically developing its material and technical base, strengthening the kolkhoz and sovkhoz economy, perfecting management and improving the interconnection among all sectors within the agroindustrial complex, and displaying greater activeness and efficiency in the expansion of interfarm cooperation. Going further also means paying greater attention to capital construction, the solution of social problems, and the organizational and ideological work in the countryside.

The high effectiveness of the present agrarian policy of the CPSU, formulated on a long-range basis, is ensured by the comprehensive and firm inter-related development of all basic aspects of the sovkhoz-kolkhoz sector:

Material-technical, organizational, economic, and socio-political. It is precisely this that the party considers a guarantee for success in the implementation of the measures ensuring a sharp agricultural upsurge.

Developing and Bringing Closer the Two Forms of Socialist Ownership in the Countryside

As we know, in the course of the socialist changes, two basic forms of socialist ownership develop: State (of the whole people) and kolkhoz-cooperative. In terms of their social nature these are identical forms of ownership. The same economic laws of socialism operate in the state and the cooperative sectors of the national economy. However, despite all their common aspects, these two forms of socialist ownership are quite different from each other. This is based on differences in the methods governing their structure and functioning. Equally different are the levels of production forces operating in the state and the kolkhoz-cooperative public production sectors.

The central problem in managing the processes leading to the improvement of socialist ownership is that of the development of both forms until they have been transformed into a single national ownership. On the basis of the Marxist-Leninist agrarian theory and the practice of socialist construction, the party believes that the basic direction in the shaping of this ownership is the all-round development of both state and kolkhoz-cooperative forms of ownership, gradually rising the latter to the level of the socialization and scientific and technical equipment reached by the state form of ownership. "The economic blossoming of the kolkhoz system," the CPSU program stipulates, "creates conditions for the gradual rapprochement and, in the future, merger between kolkhoz ownership and national ownership within a single communist ownership." Consequently the problem lies not in the accelerated merger of the two existing forms of ownership but of their steady and rapid development and gradual rapprochement and, as objective conditions ripen, their conversion into a single ownership of the whole people.

Our country has created the necessary conditions for the all-round improvement of the kolkhoz-cooperative form of ownership and for its ever growing likening to the state form. The CPSU agrarian policy which calls for the participation of the entire people in the upsurge of agriculture is actively influencing this process. As a result, the contribution of the working class, engineering and technical workers, scientists, and the state as a whole increases in the creation of productive capital of kolkhozes and inter-kolkhoz organizations, and increasing the size of kolkhoz fixed capital and property.

In the course of its existence kolkhoz-cooperative property has increased several hundred percent and has radically changed qualitatively, becoming ever more similar to state property both in terms of its material structure and socioeconomic content. The interests of the kolkhoz members themselves are no longer contained within the narrow frameworks of group ownership but include concern for affairs effecting the rayon, the republic, and the entire country.

As socialism reaches a higher level of maturity the state agrarian sector becomes ever stronger and broader. This trend is manifested in the increased number of state agricultural enterprises and the growth of their assets and other resources. Between 1959 and 1976 the number of sovkhozes in the country rose from 6,500 to 19,600 while the share of the sovkhoz land in the public sector rose from 34 to 65 percent. Sovkhoz material and technical facilities rose considerably.

The practical implementation of the measures formulated by the party for strengthening the material and technical base of kolkhozes and sovkhozes, scientific and technical progress, upgrading the living standard of the rural workers, and raising their conscientiousness and professional skills led to the fast growth of agricultural production forces. Under such conditions some organizational forms of production and economic relations in the agrarian sector fell behind the level reached by production forces. This began to restrain the further development of kolkhoz-cooperative and state ownership in the villages.

It is a question, above all, of a certain disproportion between the increased possibilities of industry to satisfy the needs of agriculture for highly productive equipment, the ability of science to equip it with effective technologies and high yielding crop strains and reliable economic solutions, and the considerably enhanced cultural and technical training of the rural workers, on the one hand, and the relatively low level of socialization of socialist ownership in the countryside and its containment within multi-sectorial farms which splinter the production process, on the other.

As a rule, in terms of its scale of output and economic possibilities, the individual multi-sectorial farm is unable to acquire the full set of power intensive machinery needed for the comprehensive mechanization of all labor processes. Should such possibility develop, the multi-sectorial farm turns out unable effectively to apply the machinery in its splintered production. Consequently, even with available equipment, many production processes in the villages are not mechanized and many operations are performed manually. In turn, the industrial sectors supplying agriculture with production capital, particularly those producing powerful equipment, are being held back in their development.

The further growth of the agrarian sector is hindered today also by the considerable disparity between the economic situation of the farms and their ability to solve production and social problems. Rather substantial disparities exist among the farms in terms of availability of capital and power generating facilities, gross output per unit of land area, gross and net income, level of profitability, and social development. Naturally, the economic status of the individual farm is affected, not in the least, by the level reached in the organization of output and management, the discipline and responsibility of its personnel, their skills, and the skillful utilization of production reserves and the achievements of scientific and technical progress. Furthermore, the differentiation in the economic status of the farms largely depends on the effect of objective factors.

The influence of such factors is related, above all, to the existence of the differentiated rentals I and II. This is specifically expressed in terms of the surplus product obtained by the farms over and above the added product created by the labor collectives under standard production conditions on which the price setting practice is based. The variety in income levels also arises as a result of the different depth of penetration of technical progress in the different sectors in which the farm is specializing on a planned basis. For example, the kolkhozes earn substantial additional income as a result of state measures related to land reclamation, protection of the soil from water and wind erosion, struggle against crop and animal pests and diseases, and the construction of roads and power transmission lines. As we know, kolkhozes on whose territory or near whose territory such measures are carried out derive additional income.

With a view to equalizing the economic opportunities of the farms the state set zonal purchase prices for crop and animal husbandry products and differentiated tax rates. On the basis of local conditions it formulates plans for the purchasing of agricultural commodities and adopts other regulatory measures according to which a certain share of the surplus income earned by the farms is deposited into the state centralized fund. However, such measures are insufficient for the more rational and equitable redistribution of the surplus income, as a result of which social ownership in some farms goes faster than in others.

One of the adverse social consequences of this situation is the violation of the principle of payment based on the quantity and quality of invested labor. For example, in kolkhozes earning additional income from better production conditions, including those created by the state, the kolkhoz members have higher earnings compared with the workers in other farms for an equal amount of work. Thus, in 1977, 78 percent of Moldavian kolkhozes ensured payments per man day equalling five rubles. This is below the average wage paid sovkhos workers; in 16 percent of the farms wages almost reached the sovkhos level, i.e., 5.4 rubles per man/day; 6 percent of the kolkhozes were able to pay 6 to 7 rubles.

Other contradictions in production-economic relations have piled up in the course of the development of rural production forces. The further development of agriculture and the improvement of both forms of socialist ownership require the elimination of such contradictions.

Intensifying Agricultural Production Cooperation and Integration

The long-term measures formulated by the party for the concentration and specialization of agricultural production on the basis of interfarm cooperation and agroindustrial integration and the combination of science with production were precisely aimed at making production relations in agriculture more consistent with its highly developed production forces. The kolkhoz peasantry unanimously supports the party's trend in the development of public production in the countryside. It boldly undertook the further socialization of kolkhoz production through integrated ownership of inter-kolkhoz organizations.

A total of 360 interkolkhoz enterprises, organizations, and associations have been created and are successfully operating in Moldavia, covering nearly all agricultural sectors. They are already employing over 120,000 workers. The capital assets of such organizations have reached 1.3 billion rubles. In 1977 their facilities accounted for one-third of the kolkhoz output.

Interkolkhoz capital assets and the goods produced with their help are owned not by a single kolkhoz but by a number of farms (the kolkhozes of a rayon or of the entire republic). Interkolkhoz cooperation made it possible to develop the type of system of production relations which would actively contribute to the utilization of the tremendous opportunities of the kolkhoz-cooperative form of ownership. This system offers unlimited scope for the highly effective functioning of powerful agricultural production forces, equalizing kolkhoz production and economic possibilities.

Creating through interfarm cooperation integrated production facilities in a number of leading sectors, gradually the kolkhozes are streamlining their sectorial structure and are converting into specialized farms developing the production units offering conditions for the use of machine technology to optimal levels. Agricultural production concentration and development of specialization in basic agricultural sectors and individual farms make it possible radically to improve the effectiveness of utilization of manpower resources, productive capital, and the land. Kolkhoz income rises as a result of such processes, bigger withholdings are made for capital assets, wages rise, and the nature of labor changes.

The advantages of integrated production facilities became particularly apparent following the organization in the republic of kolkhoz councils which were given full economic management rights. Essentially, the kolkhoz councils are a new and higher stage of kolkhoz democracy, the result of its development toward further centralization in the management of the kolkhoz sector and of bringing it closer to the ways and means of management of the state agricultural sector. Yet, the democratic nature in the activities of kolkhoz councils retains all characteristic features consistent with the nature of the kolkhoz system.

In Moldavia the kolkhoz councils, together with kolkhoz boards and interfarm organizations provide practical solutions to problems of production planning and organization, and the most rational utilization of manpower resources, equipment, land, and capital investments. They apply faster the achievements of scientific and technical progress, promote the rational norming of labor and improved wages, and bear responsibility for the end results of production activities, for strengthening the economy of the farms, and the solution of social problems.

After five years of work by the kolkhoz councils as management organs (1973-1977) crop and animal husbandry production in the republic's cooperative sector rose, compared with the previous five years (1968-1972) an average

of 26 percent per 100 hectares of farmland. Grain production rose 24 percent; sugar beets, 13 percent; tobacco, 37 percent; vegetables, 63 percent; fruits, 34 percent; meat, 32 percent; eggs, 62 percent; and milk, 41 percent. This entire increase was the result of higher labor productivity.

The interkolkhoz associations considerably broadened the realm of application of technological machine complexes in all farming and animal husbandry sectors and created conditions for highly productive labor. As a result, in the past five years alone, the direct labor outlays (on an annual average basis) per quintal in the kolkhoz sector dropped as follows: Grain, 30 percent; vegetables, 26 percent; fruits, 23 percent; and grapes, 26 percent. In animal husbandry, thanks to industrial technologies, the number of workers declined by 10,000 people, or 9 percent, while labor productivity rose by one-half. At leading animal husbandry industrial type complexes output per average annual workers exceeds 100,000 rubles, thus considerably exceeding the level of this indicator in any of the republic's industrial sectors.

The increased maturity of cooperative ownership enabled the kolkhoz sector to increase production effectiveness and make distribution relations more proportional. In five years (1973-1977) net income in this sector rose 15 percent compared with the previous five years; the accumulations fund in the overall gross income totalled 29 percent.

Thus, the new direction in the organization and development of the kolkhoz system offered by the production cooperation among collective farms and the conversion to new organs for managing their activities, fully consistent with the nature of the cooperative form of ownership, provided a powerful impetus to the improvement of production-economic relations in the countryside and to the appearance and successful development, on the basis of such relations, of interkolkhoz enterprise and association property on a level higher than group kolkhoz ownership and bearing the essential features and characteristics of nationwide ownership.

Together with quantitative changes--the increased volume and role of state ownership in agriculture--major qualitative changes are taking place as well. They are specifically manifested in the further intensification of the specialization and concentration of sovkhos production and its integration with industry, scientific research institutes, design bureaus, experimental bases, and schools.

In Moldavia 240 sovkhos-plants and sovkhoses concentrated in 36 territorial agroindustrial associations are operating in the state sector on the basis of agroindustrial integration. In terms of specialization sectors they consist of four union-republic or republic agroindustrial associations organically combining agricultural with industrial production. In 1977 these enterprises, employing 135,000 people, accounted for 16 percent of the farmland, 15 percent of the gross agricultural output in the public sector, and 33 percent of the republic's entire industrial output.

Combining science with production and integration within scientific-production units of agricultural and scientific-research collectives are a highly effective way for the further advancement of state enterprises in the countryside. Today in Moldavia 122 sovkhoses and sovхоз-plants have been incorporated within 13 scientific-production associations of the republic's Ministry of Agriculture, the Moldplodoovoshchprom, Moldvinprom, Moldtabakprom, and Moldefirmaslopprom. These associations employ over 80,000 skilled workers, over 2,500 scientific workers, and over 3,000 specialists in the national economy.

The combination of agricultural schools with state agricultural enterprises also contributes to raising the level of maturity of the state forms of ownership. Sovхоз-technical schools and sovхоз-plant schools have become the organizational form of such a combination. Moldavia has 14 training-production agrarian and agroindustrial complexes within which labor is combined with training. Some 16,000 people are engaged directly in production work in such complexes; 880 instructors are conducting training and educational work with 15,000 students. Such a synthesis contributes to considerably upgrading agricultural and industrial output and, above all, actively assists the future specialists in acquiring modern knowledge and experience needed for production management.

Under the influence of agroindustrial, scientific-production, and training-production integration, the state form of ownership in the countryside, combining the interests of the working people in the various realms of social production, and rallying their efforts with a view to the accelerated development of the socialist economy, changes substantially. A rapid growth of socialization of agricultural production is taking place. The integration, concentration, and specialization processes cover not only agriculture and animal husbandry but the processing and service industries.

The progressive changes occurring within the state ownership in the countryside are a powerful factor in raising the level of maturity of the entire system of production relations in the country. These changes are actively contributing to the establishment and broadening of essentially new forms of socialist labor cooperation and the creation of a more powerful production force as a result of the joint utilization by agrarian, industrial, scientific, and other workers of modern production facilities and progressive technologies. Another important consequence of agroindustrial integration is the fact that within it the agrarian detachment of the working class is reaching a higher level of industrial organization in public production, thus contributing to the elimination of disparities between agricultural and industrial labor and between town and country.

New Aspects in the Interaction between the Two Forms of Socialist Ownership

Under developed socialist conditions, distinguished by high level of maturity of production relations, the basic forms of socialist ownership in the countryside enter the period of their joint functioning with a general upsurge of

each one of them. The voluntary merger by kolkhozes and sovkhoses of some of their capital assets and other material and financial resources within state-cooperative organizations and the creation, on this economic basis, of joint industrial production facilities consistent with the contemporary requirements of scientific and technical progress are the immediate results of this process.

In Moldavian agriculture mixed kolkhoz-sovkhoz (sovkhoz-kolkhoz) production facilities operate on an organized basis through the joint utilization of equipment and in animal husbandry, fodder production, truck gardening, and other sectors. State-cooperative organizations have been set up in virtually all sectors covered by interfarm cooperation. State assets predominate in some of them, as a result of which they are managed by the state; cooperative ownership predominates in others, managed by kolkhoz councils. Regardless of the existing ratios, in terms their technological levels, labor industrialization, productivity, and production effectiveness, such organizations are on the level of state industrial enterprises and are considerably superior to kolkhozes and sovkhoses.

The joint functioning of both forms of ownership within a single farm or sector and the organic interaction of their component parts do not mean that cooperative ownership, combined with state ownership, loses its social-class content. The same applies to the state form of ownership. Combined with state ownership for the sake of the development of powerful and highly effective production facilities and more effective production-economic relations, the state form of ownership strengthens its economic positions and acquires a powerful impetus for faster progress. On the other hand, the maturity of state ownership, naturally, is still far behind the requirements of the second phase of the communist system and the closer relationship with kolkhoz ownership provides it with an additional improvement incentive. Each form of ownership has major internal development possibilities and their joint functioning leads to the development of new sources of progress.

The accuracy of this conclusion is confirmed by the current agrarian changes. Let us take land reclamation as an example. The state has allocated and will continue to allocate huge capital investments for this purpose. The big irrigation systems created on the basis of state ownership and transferred under kolkhoz and sovkhos management could be of tremendous benefit to the farms and society. However, as a result of their splintering among the farms they are poorly used and slow to reveal their potentials. Interfarm cooperation provided a solution to this situation. The republic's sovkhoses, kolkhozes, and other state enterprises combined their technical, manpower, and financial resources within specialized reclamation associations and are now successfully operating the irrigation systems.

It is also easier to resolve problems related to the comprehensive mechanization of production processes in all crop growing and animal husbandry sectors through the combined efforts of the state and cooperative farms, i.e., with the joint functioning of both forms of ownership within single rayon mechanization and electrification associations organized by kolkhozes, sovkhoses, and other state agricultural enterprises.

The main advantage of the concentrated utilization of technical facilities is manifested in a considerable shortening of the time for the implementation of agricultural projects and their noticeable quality improvements. Not so long ago, for example, the republic's kolkhozes took 20-25 days to harvest the cereals and 30 to 40 days the corn. Now, despite considerably higher yields and with the same load per combine harvest time has been reduced, respectively, to 10 and 20 days. At the same time the straw is stacked, the stubble is broken, organic and chemical fertilizers are applied, and the land is plowed up.

The concentrated use of equipment by the rayon associations made it possible to equalize and raise the level of production mechanization in all the farms regardless of their economic condition, improve rayon agrotechnology, and considerably reduce crop disparities among farms. Ten years ago winter wheat yields in the republic averaged 20-24 quintels per hectare, not exceeding 15 to 20 quintels in a number of farms. After associations were established crop yields reached 39 quintels per hectare and even exceeded 46-50 quintels in areas where associations have been operating for several years.

The importance of and difficult to resolve problem of fodder for animal husbandry is well known. Here again life prompted a very efficient solution: The creation of specialized fodder production agroindustrial associations. In Moldavia such associations have been organized on an interfarm basis. They have irrigated land, mixed fodder plants, and enterprises for the production of feeds and biopreparations. They are becoming stronger, proving their tremendous possibilities for supplying the cattle with fodder.

Despite the fact that state-cooperative associations are merely taking their initial steps, the results of their activities and the prospects opening to them, as well as the unanimous support they enjoy among kolkhoz members and sovkhoz workers, collectives of industrial enterprises, and procurement-marketing organizations, give us all the necessary reasons to claim that such a form of rapprochement and interaction between the two forms of ownership has a great future and that it is precisely it that will become the core of the single ownership by the whole people.

The political significance of state-cooperative ownership is clearly manifested in the exceptionally effective production relations and increased management democracy. This rallies even more closely the working class with the toiling peasantry in the country.

On the economic level, state-cooperative ownership raises the level of production and labor socialization and increases their concentration and specialization. It makes it possible to lay modern highly effective scientific and technical foundations under all agricultural sectors, the processing industry, and the areas supporting such sectors. It contributes to the equalization of the economic conditions of kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other enterprises. It makes it possible to determine far better the advantages of large-scale specialized output, converting it into a powerful base for the socioeconomic development of the country.

On the social level, the joint operation of state and cooperative property creates conditions for ensuring equal wages for equal labor of kolkhoz members and workers, for upgrading the cultural and living standards of the rural workers, making them equal to those of the cities. It leads to the elimination of class differences. In the qualitatively new production collectives such as kolkhoz-sovkhoz enterprises and associations the responsibility of the workers in the agrarian and industrial public production sectors, and their interest in the end results of joint activities increase.

Successfully developing, state-cooperative ownership will unquestionably accelerate the process of agrarian, agroindustrial, and scientific-production integration, and industrialization of agricultural labor. It will bring about important socio-class changes in the countryside and will play a historical role in the creation of the material and technical foundations for communism and the establishment of communist social relations.

Clearly, before all this happens, kolkhoz-cooperative ownership must go through a historical period of operating in interfarm organizations together with state property. It is within the framework of such organizations that the most efficient methods of farming and most expedient production-economic relations will be developed, thus creating objective prerequisites for the conversion to an integrated nationwide ownership which will be the predecessor of communist ownership.

Further improvements in the rural economic system and the creation of all required conditions for the highly dynamic functioning of the powerful production forces in agriculture are an exceptionally complex and important problem. Its solution calls for the improvement of intersectorial ratios and the optimized exchange of activities among the agrarian sector, the industrial sectors, and the service industry. Also required is a more flexible use of purchase prices which would take more fully into consideration changes which have occurred in agricultural production under the influence of scientific and technical progress and other factors. The raise as of 1 January 1979 of purchase prices with no changes in the retail prices of milk, potatoes, some vegetables, and other products will represent a tangible economic support of the sectors producing such commodities and will contribute to the increased effectiveness of overall agricultural production. As was noted at the July plenum, the work on improving purchase prices must continue.

The conversion of agriculture to industrial methods raises requirements facing the industry which supplies equipment to the countryside. Currently such equipment is not produced on the basis of the need for comprehensive mechanization of all production operations. As a whole, a major disproportion has developed between the power capacities in agriculture and the set of machines and machine units needed for their priming. Based on the structure of Moldavian agricultural production, the ratio between them should be 1:3 whereas, in fact, it is 1:1.5. As a result of the inadequate combination of machinery the utilization of power capacities is reduced.

The implementation of a number of CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decrees, approved at the July plenum, on the further development and increased effectiveness of agricultural production will be of tremendous assistance in the comprehensive mechanization of production processes in the countryside and the upsurge of its economy and culture.

The plenum made it incumbent upon the USSR Council of Ministers, USSR Gosplan, and USSR Ministry of Agriculture, and the local party, soviet, and agricultural organs to keep their attention focused on rural economic problems, on upgrading production effectiveness and lowering production costs, and on improving economic relations among the sectors within the agroindustrial complex. Such relations should contribute to the development of common interests shared by the state, the kolkhozes, and the immediate producers and be an active factor in the growth of labor productivity. The plenum emphasized the exceptional importance of the party's course of agricultural production specialization and concentration on the basis of interfarm cooperation and agroindustrial integration.

The integration processes currently taking place within the country's agroindustrial complex must be studied more profoundly. Reality demands the formulation of the organizational and economic principles governing contemporary concentration and specialization in the agrarian and industrial sectors of the national economy, and in the areas of their production support and servicing.

The personnel of interfarm and agroindustrial associations need scientific recommendations on the optimal sizes of integrated production facilities, the correlation of leading and satellite sectors within them, methods for the reorganization of capital assets in multi-sectorial farms, and the formulation of norms and other criteria of production relations among cooperated farms. They also need recommendations for a better organization of accounts established among production subunits within an association, income distribution, formation and utilization of centralized funds, standardization of regulations on economic management in state, kolkhoz, and interkolkhoz enterprises of the same type, and on other matters new to agricultural practice.

Now, when both forms of socialist ownership have entered the stage of joint functioning, it is important to eliminate promptly the legal norms no longer consistent with the changes which have taken place in rural organizational-economic structures, and to formulate new ones which would contribute to the successful development of state-kolkhoz production. It is a question, above all, of completing the "weeding" of the legislation from obsolete acts no longer consistent with the contemporary requirements of legal controls in agriculture, hindering the development of social relations which are being established in the period of mature socialism and developing under the conditions of agroindustrial integration.

It is necessary to refine and broaden the legislation controlling the activities of interfarm, agroindustrial, scientific-production, and other integrated enterprises and associations, as well as their internal and external production-economic relations. The recently adopted General Regulation on Interfarm Enterprise (Organization) does not, unfortunately, cover all aspects of their comprehensive activities.

Improvements must also be made to the legal regulation of labor relations among workers of interfarm and agroindustrial enterprises and associations. Even though kolkhoz members, workers, and employees working in interfarm units enjoy the same rights and obligations based on their labor activities some problems related to the status of each of the social groups represented in the interfarm enterprise have not as yet been resolved.

The division of labor and production concentration have led to a certain sectorial structure in the management of the agroindustrial economy and in scientific research. However, important administrative functions have been divided among a number of ministries, departments, and scientific centers, thus lowering the effectiveness of management and scientific research. A coordinating organ which, in our view, should be set up in the country and the individual republics, could play a positive role in the elimination of such shortcomings and in ensuring the coordinated activities of the entire agroindustrial complex of the country. In Moldavia, for example, coordination functions could be successfully implemented by an agroindustrial complex council which would include the heads of agrarian and agroindustrial ministries and departments, the Gosplan, the Central Statistical Administration, Moldsel'khozstekhnika, and a number of other organizations.

All these problems are directly related to the development of and rapprochement between the two forms of socialist ownership, as well as the economic and social progress of the Soviet countryside, the new levels for which were earmarked at the July 1978 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. Creatively developing and systematically implementing the theoretical stipulations of Marxism-Leninism on the building of communism, our party considers socialist ownership and the blossoming and rapprochement between its forms a factor for all-round progress of mature socialism, for intensifying the social homogeneity of society, and the establishment of communist social relations.

5003

CSO: 1802

EXPERIENCE IN ORGANIZING RURAL COMPETITION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 78 pp 44-52

[Article by G. Zimanas, editor in chief of KOMUNISTAS, Communist Party of Lithuania Central Committee Journal; published as a basis for discussion]

[Text] The July 1978 CPSU Central Committee Plenum faced agriculture with the main task of achieving the all-round and dynamic development of all its sectors and ensuring the reliable supply of the country with food and agricultural raw materials in such a way that their increased output would ensure the further considerable enhancement of the people's living standard. This problem can be resolved by increasing the material and technical resources of agriculture, extensive agricultural production intensification, and all-round utilization of its economic potential.

Warmly approving the program of measures earmarked in the plenum, the rural workers are actively engaging in its practical implementation. They are focusing their efforts on bringing into action all production reserves and overfulfilling the five-year plan. The party's strategic slogan is struggle for effectiveness and quality. In order to make it the battle slogan of all rural workers and of every worker in agriculture-related sectors, all economic units, from top to bottom, must launch an adamant struggle for economy and thrift, lowering production costs, comprehensively upgrading labor productivity, and putting an end to negligence and waste. This will call for upgrading the level of organizational work in the countryside and for improving further the organization of the socialist competition. "The final economic objective of the competition," stated Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in his report to the plenum, "is the production of more and less expensive grain, meat, milk, and other products. In this case it is important to know how precisely the best results have been achieved, and by virtue of what specific reasons some have rushed ahead while others have remained on the same level, and others again have even fallen behind." The proper assessment of results and the formulation of scientific criteria to determine the competition winners are among the most important conditions for the successful organization of the competition. Such criteria should direct all participants in the labor competition and all collectives to the utilization of intensive farming methods. They should make it possible to establish and extensively disseminate the progressive experience of farms which have achieved high returns on investments.

A noteworthy feature of the socialist competition at the present stage is that it directs the rural workers toward upgrading the quality of the work.

The quality of the work of agricultural enterprises consists of a number of production-economic factors such as efficient production organization, strict labor rhythm, and strict observance of agrotechnical requirements. This means a thrifty personal attitude toward fixed capital and fertilizers, their rational use, economic use of working capital, best possible utilization of manpower resources, purposeful selection and breeding work, systematic cultivation of the soil (reclamation, removal of unnecessary shrubs and stones, leveling off of fields) and, naturally, conscious comradely discipline, and an atmosphere of reciprocal exactingness and mutual help in the work.

The organization of the competition should be directed precisely on achieving all this. Its results must be summed up in such a way as not only to determine the winners who have obtained the highest results but also assess individual contributions to upgrading effectiveness in accordance with factual differences in the production base. Only in such a case could the outcome of the labor rivalry not be predetermined by the existence of more favorable conditions and, displaying maximum persistence, all collectives would be able to compete for the first places, thus increasing overall production results.

Such an approach is particularly important in agriculture. Considerable disparities exist among kolkhozes and sovkhoses in the size of their fixed and working capital and available manpower. This affects the results of their work. No less important is the quality of the main productive capital--the land--and its fertility and location. With identical labor and fund outlays, as a result of different qualities of the land and natural factors, the individual farms may have different outputs. Therefore, outlays per unit of output vary. Naturally, under the influence of the developing production forces and thanks to the utilization of scientific achievements, land fertility and location in terms of marketing centers change. The use of fertilizers, irrigation and drainage, use of proper crop rotation, and other measures upgrade the quality of the soil. The growth of cities, the appearance of new industrial centers, and the development of transportation introduce substantial changes to the location of the various land sectors, bringing closer in time and space the production and marketing of agricultural commodities. Nevertheless, certain differences will be retained. This characteristic of agricultural production must be taken more actively into consideration in order to determine the real champions and justly assess the quality of the work of each labor collective.

There was a time when it seemed to many of us that all problems related to socialist competition in the villages could be resolved simply. Being within the same republic meant identical conditions for the workers and, therefore, that each farm should yield as much output as its neighbors, no less. It was not considered that crops grown on sandy loam or on rich humous could not be the same. The situation changed when a land evaluation was

made in Lithuania on the basis of which all rural rayons were classified into four groups based on the quality of the soil. This led to respective changes in the organization of the competition which developed among rayons and farms within each group. The leading positions were determined on the basis of the highest basic indicators reached in crop growing, animal husbandry, mechanization, and production-economic activity. In crop growing, for example, output was considered (in terms of conventional units) per hectare of farm land, its growth compared with the previous year, the yield, and the fulfillment of the plan for sales to the government.

This principle in organizing the competition made it possible to create conditions for a more objective comparison of work results. However, this too proved inadequate, for only one of the conditions determining end production results was taken into consideration: The quality of the land (while certain differences remained even within a single group), whereas factors such as the volume of the productive and working capital and manpower availability, which influenced the growth of gross output, were totally ignored.

Since the leading farms had already broke their fields in order, had a large number of animal husbandry and other premises, equipment, highly productive herds, and others, however hard the "middle" collectives and lagging farms might have tried, even with greater labor outlays, in a single year they not only could not reach the results of their famous neighbors, but even come close to them. One year would pass, followed by another (the results of each measure in agricultural production do not become immediately apparent), and, in terms of absolute indicators, such farms would still be far behind the competition winners. Such a situation frequently undermines the faith of the collectives and their managers in their own strength, triggering disappointment and lowering the initiative. Naturally, the raykoms, rayon executive committees, and republic's ministry of agriculture were able to see that changes had occurred in such farms. However, the absolute figures were the ones considered. Who could object to indicators such as an average yield of 40 quintels per hectare? Who would consider the fact that the leading farm could be able to grow not 40 but 50 quintels? Naturally, any such demand would be considered unfair.

This frequently undermines the foundations of competitiveness. In sports, for example, no one would allow a heavy weight to compete with a light weight or a motor cyclist with a cyclist. Yet, it is precisely thus that rural competition is frequently conducted in accordance with existing assessment criteria. The rayon agricultural administration could name with almost unerring accuracy, at the very beginning of the year, the leading, average, and lagging farms. Obviously, such competition becomes ineffective.

In order to upgrade its effectiveness equal conditions must be created for each participant. Labor results must be objectively assessed. Positive changes in the work of all kolkhozes and sovkhoses must be noted on time and so must the extent to which the farms have used their potentials for the development of output. The overall objective of the competition,

naturally, remains: To obtain as much output per hectare as possible. No one intends to belittle the importance of records. However, in order for such records to become the universal norm, the center of gravity in assessing farm results must be shifted: Results must be compared not only in terms of absolute indicators but of the extent of utilization of resources, and the growth rates of agricultural output. It is precisely this that directs the labor collectives to work for a steady increase in public production effectiveness.

Bearing in mind this ripe need, at the beginning of the Ninth Five-Year Plan the Lithuanian SSR Scientific Research Institute of Agricultural Economics suggested a new method for summing up the results of the competition making it possible to determine more accurately what precisely a given collective or rayon had accomplished in the current period, and what progress had been reached in public production intensification. Substantial disparities exist among some Lithuanian farms and rayons in terms of gross production output. It was necessary, above all, to determine the extent to which they were caused by differences in the levels of production resources available to the farms. Thanks to the use of economic-mathematical methods it became possible to determine that deviations from the average are caused by the influence of four basic factors acting simultaneously and on an inter-related basis. It was determined that 25 percent of the deviations are caused by the quality of the land; 24 percent by the availability of productive capital; 35 percent by material working capital; and 12 percent by manpower. Obviously, all these factors must be taken together into consideration in determining farm potentials. Let us see how the comprehensive indicator determining such possibilities is computed by taking Birzhayskiy Rayon, in Lithuania, as an example.

Here the quality of the land has been given a 46 point rating. Since the average soil quality indicator for Lithuania is 37 points and deviations from the median, as was pointed out, are based on 25 percent land quality breakdowns, according to this indicator, the land in Birzhayskiy Rayon would be equal to 31.1 ($46:37 \times 25$). The same method is used in determining the indicators for the fixed (22.3 points) and working (31.5 points) capital, and for manpower resources (10.4). The comprehensive rating of Birzhayskiy Rayon would be, therefore, 95.3 ($31.1 + 22.3 + 31.5 + 10.4$). In 1976 the average republic output per comprehensive point equalled 5.29 rubles. Multiplying 5.29 times the comprehensive rating of Birzhayskiy Rayon would show the rayon's potential--504.1 rubles (5.29×95.3). This computed norm for gross output in terms of value per hectare is compared with factual yields.

Similar methods are used to compute the normed output in animal husbandry and crop growing which the rayon or farm could reach on the basis of available fixed capital, percentage of reclaimed land in terms of total farmland, amount of applied fertilizer (in kilograms of effective substance), amount of domestic and purchased fodder (in terms of 100 fodder units) per hectare of farmland, and others. The better a rayon or farm uses its possibilities the higher it should be placed in the competition for outstripping the estimated output level.

Not all kolkhozes or sovkhoses could make immediately full use of their potentials and outstrip the estimated level. In order to prevent such farms from being automatically eliminated from the competition, another work rating criterion was applied at the same time: Growth rates. Kolkhozes and sovkhoses which assume leading positions on the basis of this indicator are awarded the same bonuses as those leading in terms of the first indicator. A consideration of growth rates is an important incentive in involving all labor collectives in the competition and raising the overall level of agricultural output.

The simplicity of the new system of indicators makes its use possible by each farm and rayon.

The Birzhayskiy Rayon experiment was initiated in 1971. Its purpose was to test the new system for organizing the competition as suggested by the institute. The results were so unexpected that some farm managers and specialists telephoned the raykom asking whether an error had been made.

Thus, in crop growing, the first place was won by the kolkhoz imeni Yu. Yanonis (with a conventional output per hectare of farmland 6.3 quintels above the planned potential indicator); the second place was won by the Shvituris Kolkhoz (3.6 quintels). The Peshtuvenay and Yestrakis kolkhozes which should have been the winners in the rayon on the basis of the previous method were only eighth and ninth (1.8 and 2 quintels). Such changes were noted in assessing the results of the competition in animal husbandry and economic activities as a whole: The leading positions were taken by farms doing more intensive work.

In 1973 the system was applied in Prenayskiy Rayon; it was applied in Kayshyadorskiy Rayon in 1974, in Shyaulayskiy Rayon in 1975, and, subsequently, in Kupishskiy, Alitusskiy, Raseynskiy, and other rayons. In 1978 this method of competition for best results of production and economic activities was introduced in all republic rayons.

Reality proved that the new method has a number of advantages: Change in production conditions are taken into consideration on an annual basis; achievements are judged more objectively; it offers the possibility to determine not only the first three or the first six winners, as in the past, but to establish the position of all kolkhozes and sovkhoses in the competition, both leading and lagging. Any collective could see more clearly whether or not its predetermined possibilities have been exceeded or underutilized, study the reasons, and draw proper conclusions. The equal starting positions of the rivals and the comparability of results make it possible to struggle energetically for the honor of one's collective, promote competitiveness, and increase agricultural output.

Whereas in 1973 overall yields in Birzhayskiy Rayon, for example, were 22.2 quintels per hectare they rose to 34 in 1976 (i.e., by 53 percent). Gross yields rose, respectively, from 49,600 to 91,000 quintels (83 percent).

Output per 100 hectares of land was as follows: Milk, respectively, 474 and 565 quintels (19 percent); meat, 120 and 139 quintels (16 percent); milk production per cow rose from 3,114 to 3,290 kilograms (6 percent); overall milk production rose from 41,615 to 50,974 quintels (22 percent). Profitability rose 15 percent; livestock weight rose 10 percent for cattle and 7 percent for hogs.

The most important thing was that the indicators of the farms which had been lagging for quite some time showed great improvements! In any sectors, agricultural in particular, success is determined not by the leading enterprises alone. Practical experience has indicated that their share of the output equals approximately 10-15 percent while the rest is accounted for the middle and lagging enterprises. Therefore, higher crop, milk, and weight yields in such farms are immediately reflected in considerable production increases on the republic's scale.

Birzhayskiy Rayon, in particular, has two kolkhozes--Laysvoyi Zhyame (Free Land) and Dumoyyelis. The former's fixed capital is twice the size of the latter and the land quality ratings are, respectively, 64 and 52. Dumoyyelis is suffering from manpower shortages--there are 16 hectares of farmland per able bodied kolkhoz member, compared with 11 hectares in Laysvoyi Zhyame. Nevertheless, in terms of the rate of output achieved in the 1976 competition, Dumoyyelis won over its famous rival, previously considered invincible. It achieved higher daily increases in the fattening of hogs, young pigs, and calves. Above all, profitability reached 75.3 percent or 42 percent higher than at Laysvoyi Zhyame. This was the result of the new rating system which takes into consideration all basic production factors contributing to the boosting of initiative and labor enthusiasm.

It should not be considered that the new system for summing up competition results benefits the weak farms only, urging them forward, leaving the champions behind. The strong kolkhozes remained strong and their successes increased. This is explained, among others, by the fact that the relatively weaker farms began to compete with them in fact rather than formally. This forces the leading kolkhozes to seek ways to ensure the better use of their potential.

The results of 1976, when the previously lagging farm began to follow close on the heels of a strong rival, forced the collective of the Laysvoyi Zhyame to adopt a stricter attitude toward results and mobilize its reserves. In 1977 it averaged 50 quintels of grain crops per hectare; the sugar beet yield reached 320 quintels per hectare, while average milking per cow reached 3,700 liters. These results are among the best in the republic and represent a great achievement for the farm.

When the competition conditions in Birzhayskiy Rayon were published for the first time the skeptics predicted that the new system would not stimulate increases in the capital-labor ratio. They stated that a lesser number of buildings and equipment would give the farm better competition conditions. If less is demanded of it what would be the purpose of building or purchasing new machinery?

Those who expressed this view failed to take into consideration the fact that the selected indicators aim at production intensification, i.e., at increasing the volume of output per hectare through better utilization of resources and growth of labor productivity. These factors are also directly linked, in particular, with the level of the capital-labor ratio. Therefore, it is clear that competition conditions lead toward comprehensive production mechanization related to the use of machine systems. The new indicator accounting method has been undergoing "field tests" in the sovkhozes and kolkhozes of Birzhayskiy Rayon for over seven years. Meanwhile, demand for equipment has been growing and the number of requests for construction has nearly tripled. Consequently, the very conditions of the competition direct its participants toward both increasing their fixed capital and ensuring its rational use.

We could say now that the experiment was successful. A system has developed which makes it possible to estimate more accurately the effectiveness of kolkhoz and sovkhoz work, express it in figures, and identify the collectives which are able to organize their work, make use of their reserves, and intensify their output. The perfecting of the system will continue. However, unquestionably, a base has been created which would enable us to develop true competitiveness and ensure a most important competition condition such as result comparability.

Any theory, V. I. Lenin wrote, "becomes animate through practice, corrected through practice, and tested through practice . . ." ("Poln Sobr Soch" [Complete Collected Works], Vol 35, p 202). This means that we must also constantly study the way the organization of the competition in the countryside and the methods used for determining its results enable us to use consciously and systematically the creativity of the masses, directing their constructive energy into the struggle not only for quantitative indicators but for upgrading production effectiveness and work quality.

Practical experience has proved that the new method for summing up competition results in the countryside must be perfected: The criteria used to assess the work of collectives must be refined, certain changes must be made to the existing systems for the planning and allocation of material resources, and so on. For example, so far, the adoption of socialist pledges is based only on the level of output reached the previous year, ignoring the factual possibilities of the farm. Since according to the new system competition results are expressed in conventional units the resulting data do not coincide with the plan and the obligations. Obviously, it would be more expedient to recompute in advance production-financial assignments, based on the new method, and take them as a base in the formulation of obligations.

Production quality indicators must play an important role in increasing the production of milk, meat, grain, and fodder, in improving their quality, and in lowering material and labor outlays. Yet, according to the new method (as in the old one) milk fat content, beet sugar content, or flax staple quality are not taken into consideration. The same could be said of important indicators such as net income, capital returns, production cost, profitability, and so on. Obviously, this situation must be corrected.

The methods used in the rating of productive capital must be refined. As we know, the prices for the construction of animal husbandry premises have been raised several times. As a result, a paradoxical situation occasionally develops: Two farms may have cow barns of identical capacity. The first barn may have been built at an earlier time thus making the second considerably more expensive. Even though, according to the papers, the second farm has greater capital assets, naturally, it can not raise more animals. We believe that all buildings should be assessed on the basis of fixed prices. It would also be expedient to include them among the capital assets only when they have been factually completed. Otherwise the possibilities of some farms in the field of animal husbandry would be raised artificially.

The new system for summing up competition results calls for the proper solution of the problem of supplying the farms with fertilizers, construction materials, mixed fodders, and equipment. Quite understandably, such items are not provided by nature. Furthermore, their allocation is far from always most equitable. Occasionally, a very resourceful manager could "extract" for his farm more than is given others (furthermore, at their expense). In order to prevent this, in the republic fertilizers are allocated on the basis of the recommendations of the Institute of Agricultural Economics (based on the number of hectares of plowland and soil quality). Obviously, a similar method should be elaborated for the allocation of construction materials, mixed feeds, and equipment. Naturally, in this case the responsibility of the collectives for the efficient utilization of such allocations must be raised.

The existing method for rating the growth rates of the farms must be improved, for it is easier to improve results starting at a low or middle level. Therefore, it is necessary to establish a certain limit after which the production of each additional kilogram of meat, liter of milk, or quintel of crop should be assessed on the basis of a higher scale with a correction coefficient and taken into consideration in summing up results. Otherwise, collectives which have reached a high production level would find it difficult to win in the competition for higher production rates.

Reality has indicated that, occasionally, a situation may develop in which the kolkhoz (sovkhoz) has made insufficient use of its reserves, produced at less than capacity, and, the following year, somewhat improve its position. If its work is judged by its condition at the beginning of the year, immediately that farm becomes a possible winner in terms of the growth of production rates. In order to prevent such cases it would be expedient, in summing up competition results, to take as a basis for comparison the results not only of the previous year but of the previous two to three years. This would enable us to avoid a hasty conclusion and establish the true winners who are gradually yet systematically improving their indicators.

According to the new system competition results are summed up on a quarterly basis for animal husbandry and annually for crop growing. On the one hand, this enables us to determine the main fact: End results (in the past

it has frequently happened that over a period of time farm indicators have been good whereas quarterly or annual results have been minor). On the other hand, however, in such a case, occasionally, the people assume the position of passive observers instead of (once the lagging has been established) actively influencing the course of events and making the necessary corrections to the work. This is particularly important in animal husbandry. Obviously, in this area competitions should be promoted and preliminary competition results summed up not only on a quarterly basis but more frequently. Such is precisely the case now in rayons whose farms are competing according to the new system. This enables us to ensure competitiveness even among individual kolkhoz members, by supplementing the competition system with a system of individual contests among rural workers.

The Belorussian Institute of Agricultural Production Economics and Organization developed a method for summing up competition results in kolkhozes and sovkhozes. This method as well is based on a comparison between the factual and the estimated levels of agricultural production, and on growth rates. This new competition organization method is extensively applied in Minskaya, Vjbskaya, and Grodnenskaya oblasts. However, so far most farms, rayons, and oblasts in the country are applying the "classical" forms of labor competitiveness which were developed 10 to 15 years ago: Competition based on overall output (or per unit of area), by type of farm crop or animal husbandry product, and on the basis of the implementation of various field operations. This does not adequately direct kolkhozes and sovkhozes to the solution of the main economic problem: Higher effectiveness.

"The study of local experience more and more specifically, of individual parts, minor matters, practice, and practical experience, deeper study of real life . . . study of who succeeds, where, and why (through what methods) . . . in achieving true even though minor improvements; fearless exposure of errors and inability . . ." Lenin wrote ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 54, p 237). This Leninist instruction must be used: New methods and practices in organizing rural competition must be studied; the most valuable experience must be brought to light and existing shortcomings removed.

The CPSU Central Committee decree on improving the organization of the socialist competition further, passed as early as 1971, noted that, "the AUCCTU, USSR Academy of Sciences, USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, and USSR Council of Ministers State Committee for Labor and Wages shall take measures to improve the practice of summing up specific experience and for the more profound theoretical elaboration of problems related to the further development of the socialist competition . . ." Currently an expanded coordination plan has been drawn up for scientific research between 1976 and 1980 and approved by the organizations listed above. It includes about 70 most important topics whose elaboration involves the work of 27 USSR Academy of Sciences institutes and academies of union republics, 35 sectorial scientific research institutes of ministries and departments, over 120 VUZ social science departments, and so on. The theoretical studies of the general problems related to socialist competition must be based on a comprehensive approach and sum up the

experience acquired in its organization in all economic sectors, agriculture included. The scientific collectives working on such problems in accordance with the coordination plan must pay greater attention to this aspect of the work. At the same time, the plan should include separate studies of the characteristics of competition in the countryside. Currently the plan includes only one such topic and, so far, no practical results have been obtained.

In order to organize competition in agriculture on a scientific basis the lagging of scientific research in this area must be surmounted. The collegium of the USSR Ministry of Agriculture and the Trade Union Central Committee Presidium recommended to the main administrations in charge of agricultural science and propaganda and higher and secondary agricultural training as well as to the All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences imeni Lenin to adopt in the 10th Five-Year Plan measures for the elaboration of new methods for the organization of the competition and summing up its practical experience, paying particular attention to the quality of research and recommendations for upgrading its effectiveness. In accordance with the adopted decree a number of measures were implemented aimed at improving the organization of competition in the villages. Currently the ministry is formulating a coordination plan for research on the development of socialist competition in agriculture. The scientific collectives involved in such research have been assigned a broad range of tasks which include the elaboration of recommendations for the use of efficient methods of labor competitiveness and the formulation of criteria for comparing and assessing competition results achieved by its individual participants, entire collectives, and others. It would be quite useful to make a careful study of the already applied new methods for summing up rural competition results and improve them in such a way as to develop in the future a uniform coordinated system for assessing the work of farms and rayons.

The elaboration of rural competition criteria is not a self-seeking aim. It is needed in order to upgrade the labor activeness of the masses and direct them toward the more successful implementation of the main tasks of the five-year plan: Upgrading effectiveness and quality in order to "block," as Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out at the 25th CPSU Congress, "all loopholes which still allow negligent economic managers to assume leading positions . . ." That is precisely why constant concern for the vitality and realistic nature of criteria used in assessing competition results is one of the most important factors for upgrading its effectiveness, developing mass creativity, and converting to more intensive economic management methods.

5003

CSO: 1802

OBJECT OF GREAT PATRIOTIC ATTENTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 78 pp 53-66

[Article by the journal CHELOVEK I ZAKON, KOMMUNIST collective correspondent]

[Text] The socialist state is concerned with the preservation, multiplication, and extensive popularization of spiritual values which are of tremendous importance to the moral and esthetic upbringing of the Soviet people and to enhancing their cultural standards. This is codified in Article 27 of the new Soviet Constitution. Its factual implementation is achieved through the USSR law "On the Preservation and Utilization of Historical and Cultural Monuments," enacted over one year ago. Its promulgation by the supreme organ of the Soviet system was a noteworthy event which reflected the tremendous and tireless concern of the Communist Party and Soviet state for exposing the toiling masses to the highest achievements of the human genius and the ever fuller satisfaction of the steadily growing spiritual requirements of our people.

From its very first steps the young Soviet republic unequivocally defined its policy on the problem of its attitude toward past culture and the use of cultural legacy and progressive democratic traditions in the building of socialism. The myth of the doom and destruction of Russian culture, rumors on the raking of museums, burning of libraries, and destruction of architectural monuments, maliciously disseminated by the enemies of the revolution, and the nihilistic feeble impulses of all kinds of extreme leftwing currents were countered by the scientific position of the Bolshevik Party, and the Leninist concept of cultural continuity, based on the objective dialectics of social development. "We must take the entire culture left by capitalism and build socialism from it," V. I. Lenin said. "We must take all science, technology, all knowledge, all art. Without this we would be unable to build the life of a communist society" ("Poln Sobr Soch" [Complete Collected Works], Vol 38, p 55).

We are well familiar with the measures taken by the Soviet government aimed at the preservation, active assimilation, and broadest possible dissemination of the cultural heritage. The first legislative act directly related to

the preservation of historical and cultural monuments was passed as early as 1918, when Lenin signed the decree "On the Recording, Registration, and Preservation of Monuments of Art and Antiquity Owned by Private Individuals, Societies, or Institutions." That same year decrees on the nationalization of the Tret'yakov Gallery, forbidding the export and sale abroad of objects of art, and others, were passed. Organs in charge of protecting monuments were set up in the first post-revolutionary years and highly skilled restoration collectives were set up. Thus, for the first time in history, the private initiatives of individual lovers of antiques were replaced by a state policy of careful preservation of the property of the peoples of our country and of its true mass assimilation.

It is indicative that in the most difficult periods facing the Soviet republic, when the pressure of intervention and counter-revolutionary forces had to be repelled, and economic dislocation surmounted, and when, against the background of national economic tasks, problems of historical legacy could have seemed "secondary," extensive and unique restoration projects were undertaken in the country, unexpected discoveries of new--"forgotten" or ignored--objectives of art were made, and museums and painting galleries were opened. Thus, the Perm Art Gallery was created in 1922. It was the first to present to the broad masses Perm wood sculpture; at the beginning of the 1920's a number of monuments in Yaroslavl', Moscow, and other cities were restored with the highest possible standards.

At that time V. I. Lenin wrote: "Marxism gained its universal-historical significance as the ideology of the revolutionary proletariat by virtue of the fact that it did not reject in the least the most valuable achievements of the bourgeois epoch. Conversely, it mastered and reworked anything valuable created over the more than 2,000 years of development of human thought and culture. Only further work on this basis and in the same direction, inspired by the practical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat as its final struggle against all exploitation could be considered as the development of a truly proletarian culture" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 41, p 337).

In the 1920's and beginning of the 1930's anti-Leninist promoters of a nihilistic attitude toward popular traditions succeeded in the groundless and practically totally unnecessary destruction of some historical and cultural monuments. Examples of this exist in a number of republics and ancient cities in our country. The party and the Soviet public systematically blocked such harmful impulses.

At the beginning of the 1940's our people had to defend bodily their freedom and independence and their centuries-old spiritual wealth. The aggression launched by the fascist vandals who plundered and destroyed everything along their way caused incalculable damage to the cultural heritage of the peoples of the USSR.

After the Great Patriotic War the Soviet state appropriated substantial funds for the restoration of Leningrad monuments destroyed by the fascist hordes. Initially the urgent work dealt with the preservation and, subsequently, the restoration of architectural monuments in Kiev, Novgorod, and Pskov, and the restoration of the Vitebsk Cathedral . . . a tremendous number of such examples could be cited.

It is as though the law "On the Preservation and Utilization of Historical and Cultural Monuments" crowns 60 years of work in this area, summing up results of achievements in the elaboration and adoption of corresponding legislation based on the Leninist principles governing policy in the field of culture and reflecting the truly tremendous scope of activities related to the registration and preservation of objects of architectural, memorial, or any other kind of interest.

Cultural construction is inseparably linked with achievements in the field of socioeconomic progress. It is no accident that the CPSU pays great attention to such construction, for high level culture, education, social self-awareness, and spiritual maturity are as necessary in the building of communism as the corresponding material and technical base. The growth of the former makes the development of the latter impossible, for reciprocal ties exist between the two. Economic progress ensures society new cultural possibilities, whereas the cultural growth of the working people contributes to raising the quality of the work and social production effectiveness, and the combination of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of developed socialism.

Respect for all national cultures is an essential factor in internationalist education. This factor is particularly significant in the case of our multinational socialist state. Familiarity with the progressive culture of any, big or small, nation contributes to the reciprocal enrichment of national cultures, and the elimination of occasionally remaining prejudices and lack of understanding. Equal respect for and knowledge of the culture of one's nation and of the fraternal peoples creates a solid spiritual foundation for the promotion of Soviet patriotism and proletarian internationalism.

Yet another circumstance must be taken into consideration. Under the conditions of the aggravated struggle, the forces of international reaction are greatly relying on the depreciation of true cultural values in the minds of the people, the youth above all, and on the manufacturing of cultural surrogates deprived of a positive, a constructive base. The objective is familiar: The spiritual impoverishment of the working people, the introduction of chaos in their conceptual system, the distortion of their concept of the world, and to facilitate the penetration in their hearts and minds of false ideas leading astray from the vital tasks of the struggle for the liberation of labor, peace, and social progress. The confrontation between a progressive democratic, realistic above all, art, and reactionary bourgeois modernism has reached at present a level of extreme tension. All possible varieties of the latter are energetically promoted in Western art and literature. Each new formalistic twist is presented in the West as an unparalleled "revelation" and inordinate "innovation."

It would be naive to reject the possibility that false currents could penetrate our cultural life. In this case the only antidote are the basic Marxist-Leninist principles used in assessing social phenomena, including cultural achievements. The development of an esthetic taste for the best samples of the art of the past and the monuments to the people's revolutionary and combat glory, and the development of a protective attitude toward history and the very rich spiritual heritage of our multinational country are among the effective means used to counter ideologically harmful influences. This is precisely the purpose of the aforementioned law.

The historical and cultural heritage found on the territory of our state is truly infinite. Currently the state records include over 150,000 historical, archaeological, and architectural monuments. The country has about 1,500 museums with about 50 million conservation units. This represents over 200 million items. New exhibits are being steadily added. Particularly important among them are materials characterizing the history of the Soviet state starting with the Great October Revolution to the present. Every year no less than one million new items are added.

The monuments of antiquity such as architectural systems, monument ensembles, paintings, illustrated manuscripts, small plastic art and sculpted objects, and applied art objects are the works of thousands of folk masters. They reflect the ethical and esthetic ideas and socio-political expectations of the broad toiling masses. They prove the great wisdom, moral dignity, and creative talents of the peoples inhabiting our multinational country. Proclaiming in its first decrees that the historical and historical-cultural treasures belong entirely to the people, the Soviet government pointed out not only their great material value (by nationalizing them along with the land, factories, banks, and others), but their tremendous ideological significance as well. In the course of the past decades a careful attitude was promoted toward monuments of universal importance, considered as models of the arts, as well as monuments of local significance which may be far less famous yet no less precious to every Soviet person--modest relics of the heroism of the fathers and grandfathers, the struggle of the people's masses for freedom and independence, testimony of the establishment and development of the first socialist state in the world, and objects describing the life and work of our predecessors.

According to the law, in the USSR historical and cultural monuments are the property of the people. It is precisely this that determines their significance and substantiates the meaning of their preservation and dissemination. In the socialist state they serve the development of science, public education, and culture, the shaping of the lofty feeling of Soviet patriotism, and the individual-moral, international, and esthetic education of the working people. The preservation of monuments is considered an important task of the state organs and public organizations.

Article 68 of the constitution states that "concern for the preservation of historical monuments and other cultural values is the duty and obligation of the citizens of the USSR." This stipulation in the fundamental law

considerably enhances the role and responsibility of the local authorities and soviets of people's deputies for the preservation of monuments. At the same time, the party organs call for energizing the public movement in this direction. Tireless and creative work is needed for the upbringing of the broadest possible population strata with the help of historical and cultural monuments.

The law defines the very concept of "monument." It establishes uniform criteria for the acknowledgment as a monument of any object. Historical and cultural monuments are buildings, memorial sites, and objects related to historical events in the life of the people, the development of society, and the state, and works related to material and spiritual creativity of historical, scientific, artistic, or any other cultural value.

The law classifies all monuments into five groups: History, archeology, urban construction and architecture, art, and documentary. The latter (previously not included in the regulation on the preservation of cultural monuments) includes acts of the state power and state administration organs, other written and graphic documents, motion picture and photographic documents and sound recordings, ancient and other manuscripts and archives, folklore and music recordings, and rare printed works.

All historical and cultural monuments on USSR territory are protected by the state.

Also protected by the state are newly discovered objects which could be classified as one or another type of monument until the question of their classification as historical or cultural monuments has been officially resolved. The importance and necessity of this stipulation are unquestionable. For example, in the course of repairing an old building in the center of Moscow, a 17th Century architectural monument, "Townhouse of the Boyars Matveyev," was discovered. Construction work was stopped until specialists could determine the possibility to restore and reconstruct the monument.

Currently work on the reconstruction of old built-up areas is under way in a number of cities. Many buildings and installations have not been entirely studied and we could expect many similar types of historical discoveries. It is precisely because of this circumstance that the law prescribes to construction and all other organizations and enterprises which may discover in the course of their work archeological or other projects of historical, scientific, artistic, or any other type of cultural value, to report the fact to the state organ in charge of protecting the monuments and stop further work.

The new law increases the liability of individuals guilty of violating the legislation governing the protection and utilization of historical and cultural monuments. Such responsibility could be criminal, administrative, or other, depending on the extent of the delinquency. The legislations of a number of union republics stipulate various forms of liability for certain

delinquencies (such as, for example, violation of the system for the protection of archeological areas, excavating without permission, and others). Thus, according to Article 230 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, the premeditated annihilation, destruction, or loss of cultural monuments or natural objects under the protection of the state is punished by deprivation of freedom not to exceed two years or correctional work not to exceed one year, or else a fine not to exceed 100 rubles. Individuals guilty of keeping discovered treasures which frequently include valuable historical and artistic monuments may be criminally prosecuted.

Let us note that both individuals and organizations may be charged with liability for violating the law "On the Protection and Utilization of Historical and Cultural Monuments." The strictest possible measures will be taken toward anyone who damages our property as a result of negligence or thoughtlessness.

The law pays particular attention to architectural monuments. This is not astounding in the least. The problem of their preservation and utilization is related to a number of economic, urban construction, transportation, and other problems. It also involves major outlays, requires the training of a large number of restoration specialists of various skills, and so on.

An essential change has been made in the very definition of the type of monument. Whereas previously the section "Architectural Monuments" in the regulation on the protection of monuments listed merely individual architectural works today the section is entitled "Monuments of Urban Construction and Architecture." This definition was dictated by life itself. It covers not only architectural ensembles and complexes, historical centers, districts, squares, streets, vestiges of the planning and construction of cities and other settlements, but buildings of civilian, industrial, military, or religious architecture, folk architecture, and related works of monumental, graphic, decorative-applied, garden-landscaping art, and natural landscapes.

In recent decades the party and the government have paid great attention to the recreation of specifically integral historical centers. Suffice it to recall the tremendous work done on the reconstruction and restoration of the tourist centers of Suzdal', Samarkand, Bukhara, and others, now famous throughout the world. Tremendous work has been done in the Baltic Republics for the preservation of urban construction monuments. For example, the historical centers of Vil'nyus and Tallin have been perfectly preserved. Tremendous work was done here to restore the aspect of the "old city." The problem of the use of the monuments is being resolved suitably and flexibly. The carefully preserved appearance of Leningrad is superb.

As a whole, however, the problems of the preservation and utilization of architectural complexes should not be considered totally resolved. They require a thoughtful and scientific attitude. Under the conditions governed by intensive construction strict attention must be paid to this fact, for any narrowly conceived economic approach results, sometimes, in irreversible losses.

This includes the need for extreme caution in the introduction of new monumental art works within historically developed ensembles. Manifestations of a showy "love" for antiques by embellishing a historical architectural complex with the latest sculptural or other works should not be supported. This could bring about a false trend in general or, in specific cases, could disturb the necessary harmony, distort the overall aspect of the ensemble, and lower its esthetic level. Thus, the idea of placing the bronze statue of Andrey Rublev, totally inconsistent with the surroundings of the architectural ensemble (not to mention the ideological and artistic controversy of the statue itself of the great artist whose physical features have not been preserved by history) on the small area, crowded by buildings, of the former Andronikov Monastery (14th Century), now containing a museum-preserve, would be hardly justifiable.

A scientific substantiation must be the starting point in decisions related to the preservation and restoration of historical monuments.

The violation of this condition may result in the grossest violation of the law. For example, public condemnation was expressed in connection with the attempt to build a new hipped roof of the rotunda of the Novo-Iyeruslaimskiy Monastery which would distort the aspect of a monument of universal importance. The Moscow Oblast Construction Restoration Trust undertook the work on a project rejected by the Scientific-Methodical Council for the Preservation of Cultural Monuments of the USSR Ministry of Culture. The plan was rejected because of the unacceptability of the architectural solution (the loss of a number of qualities of the Rastrelli-Blank roof, and the impossibility to preserve the previous interiors), and the groundlessness of a number of purely engineering solutions. The "zeal" displayed by the trust was even stranger considering that prior to the initiation of the work a scientifically substantiated plan had been submitted (currently backed by a photogrammetric study and the discovered 19th Century measurements) which retained all the merits of the monument, both structural and architectural-artistic.

Problems related to the preservation and restoration of classical architectural and other objects considered national property should be resolved on the level of the contemporary understanding of the tasks stemming from the USSR Constitution and the Law on the Preservation and Utilization of Historical and Cultural Monuments.

Architectural monuments can not be considered separately from their environment. Therefore, the problem of the comprehensive urban construction approach to the matter is becoming ever more important. The need to preserve the monuments as interrelated with their historical environment is becoming every more obvious. This results in their complete preservation and maximum revelation of their esthetic qualities.

The gravity of this problem becomes particularly tangible in connection with the reconstruction of a number of cities, the capital of our homeland above all. The historically developed Moscow territory is an architecturally

integral yet constantly developing environment. Whereas in past centuries the city's evolution was slow, presently the architectural aspect of the capital is changing under our very eyes. New construction is effecting not only the fate of individual monuments and architectural ensembles but the entire unique layout of the city.

Every single day thousands of tourists come to visit the capital and it is precisely the historical and most vivid originality of its old section that draws the attention of our guests. The proclamation of a number of streets as preserves has been a major step in the preservation of Moscow's historical nucleus. However, this step did not resolve by far all problems. It would be pertinent to recall that preserved streets already include modern buildings which are not always in harmony with historically important buildings and unique architectural monuments.

It would be expedient to declare Moscow's central section, within the boundaries of the Sadovoye Kol'tso, which represents no more than two percent of the city's territory, a historical-revolutionary and architectural preserve. This question has been repeatedly raised by the capital's public at plenums of the council of the Moscow City Department of the All-Russian Society for the Preservation of Historical and Cultural Monuments. Making Moscow's center a preserve would enable the organs in charge of monument protection to assume control over all problems related to the reconstruction of the city's central section. Furthermore, the historical base of the city's layout must be developed and used in the further reconstruction of the capital in order not to lose existing historical-architectural values.

Presently a commission is at work at the urban construction council of Moscow's Main Architectural-Planning Administration (GlavAPU). Together with representatives of the public organizations it is considering matters of preservation or demolition of the historical parts of the city. This is the first real manifestation of the positive effect of the Law on the Protection and Utilization of the Historical and Cultural Monuments. The commission's work has been able to prevent the demolition of a number of historically and artistically interesting buildings. An additional list of architectural monuments has been drawn up for placing under governmental control.

Restoration workshop No 13 of the Mosproyek-2 Administration, headed by RSFSR State Prize Laureate V. Ya. Libson, is doing fruitful work in studying historical buildings and discovering new architectural monuments. A great deal is being done in this respect by Moscow's public as well. The results of the studies of Moscow's center and of a number of streets within the Kamer-Kollezhskiy Rampart could become the basis of the city's historical urban construction layout.

The conduct of more systematic work on the discovery and registration of historical and cultural monuments requires a considerable increase in the rights of the Moscow City State Inspectorate for the preservation of architectural and urban construction monuments.

As a result of a certain amount of oversight, of late a number of historically important houses on Moscow's Chernyshevskiy Street, considered a preserve, were demolished; a number of monuments placed under state production are occupied by lessees who are unable to ensure the proper preservation of the buildings. Frequently, the history of even the most modest seeming buildings is related to the names of outstanding representatives of native culture, Decembrists, or members of the revolutionary movement. Familiarity with old Moscow houses, streets, or lanes is of tremendous youth educational importance. Architectural monuments and their environments teaches how to see and value beauty, and value the work of the ancient masters. They help us to become better familiar with the history of our city and people, and love our homes even more.

The awareness of this fact has been reflected in the law which stipulates that the plans for the layout, construction, and reconstruction of cities and other settlements containing historical, archeological, urban construction, and architectural and other monuments must be coordinated with the respective organs. Protected zones, construction control zones, and protected natural landscape zones are being established, in accordance with USSR and union republic legislation, to ensure the preservation of such monuments.

The staggering impact of the impression which the best Russian architectural works makes is confirmed by the following statement by the famous French composer Berlioz who visited Russia in the 1840's: "Nothing impressed me so much as the monument to ancient Russian architecture in Kolomna Village. I have seen, admired, and been impressed by a great deal. However, Russia's ancient past which left its monument in this village was to me a miracle of miracles. I have visited the Strassbourg Cathedral, which took centuries to build. I have seen the cathedral in Milan. However, other than decorations plastered on them I saw nothing. Here, however, I was faced with total beauty. Everything in me reacted. There was a mysterious silence. There was a harmony of the beauty of finished forms. I saw a new type of architecture. I saw upward strive and I was quite overwhelmed."

Today the Kolomenskoye State Preserve is one of the most beautiful parts of Moscow. It took centuries for this amazing and universally beloved ensemble to develop. Soviet men of culture have called, in the central press, for the organization of an artistic-cultural center on the territory of the preserved area of the Kolomenskoye Museum. Unfortunately, the condition of the preserve is alarming: Delayed restoration-construction projects not only lack a single general plan but, in many cases, are insufficiently substantiated and the level of their execution leads to the loss of the historical and artistic accuracy of the architectural monuments considered among the masterpieces of world art. This unique ensemble--the pride of Russian culture--is worthy of no less concern and careful restoration as, for example, the Pavlovsk Palace and Park near Leningrad.

One of the most topical and urgent problems is the expedient use of historical and cultural monuments. A number of examples to this effect could be cited. In Moscow, in addition to the Kremlin cathedrals, we should single out the ensemble of monuments of the Novodevich'yego Monastery which is a branch of the State Historical Museum; Pashkov House, which is the State Library imeni V. I. Lenin; and the Pokrov and Rubtsovo churches used as rehearsal halls for the republic choir imeni Yurlov. The palace ensembles in Arkhangel'sk, Ostankino, and Kuskovo have become state museums-preserves. In Kaluga, the State Paintings Gallery is located in Chistokletov House, while the regional museum is located in the Kologrivova-Zolotarev House. One of the Kaliningrad forts houses the amber museum. The former seminary in Lyskovo, Gor'kovskaya Oblast, houses an eighth grade school. Particularly noteworthy in terms of proper utilization of architectural monuments are the historical cities within the "golden ring" (Pereslavl'-Zalesskiy, Rostov Velikiy, Yur'yev-Pol'skiy, Vladimir, and Suzdal'), and the monuments in Leningrad, Tallin, Vil'nyus, Riga, L'vov, Kiev, and Bukhara.

As stipulated by the law, monuments may be owned by the state, kolkhozes, other cooperative organizations or their associations, public organizations, or private citizens.

Regardless of ownership, a monument is under state registration whose procedure is defined by the USSR Council of Ministers. In accordance with USSR and union republic legislations, monuments may be of all-union, republic, or local importance.

Occasionally, it is necessary to make practical use of architectural monuments. The new law as well allows such use for economic or other purposes providing that this does not harm their preservation or reduce their historical-artistic value. That is why, formulating the method for the utilization of each specific monument, we must observe such legal stipulations and not forget that, in addition to its practical functions, a given building or installation must also fulfill its basic functions as stipulated in the law: It must serve, above all, the objectives of the patriotic, ideological-moral, international, and esthetic education of the working people.

The expedient use of architectural monuments in the building of communism is a vital task. A variety of methods exist for its implementation and their effectiveness increases the more actively such monuments perform their legally stipulated functions.

In accordance with the law enterprises, organizations, and establishments which either own or use historical and cultural monuments are responsible for their preservation and must observe the rules governing their protection, utilization, registration, and restoration.

However, the picture of the condition of the preservation and utilization of the historical and cultural heritage would be quite incomplete were we to limit ourselves to positive examples alone. Alas, many departments,

enterprises, and organizations are still displaying the type of attitude toward architectural monuments they own or use that they not only no longer serve the lofty purposes stipulated in the law but are menaced by destruction. This situation becomes even more intolerable in cases when substantial people's funds have been spent in the past for their restoration.

It is inadmissible for most valuable monuments to remain empty for a number of years following their restoration and begin to break down again. This situation prevails, for example, in Ubory, a village near Moscow. Among others, a considerable number of old Russian architectural works in the Moscow area are damaged. This should concern the local party and soviet organs. Effective measures must be taken to increase the possibilities of the Moscow Oblast Construction Restoration Trust and to ensure a considerable improvement in the quality of its work.

In Dalmatovo, Kurganskaya Oblast, the ensemble of the Dalmatovo Monastery, used by the Molmashstroy Plant of the Ministry of Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances as metal casting shops has been damaged. A plan for the construction of a new shop on the monastery's territory has been ordered without coordinating it with the monument preservation organs.

For over 10 years warehouses and laboratory premises of the geological administration have been operating in the Orenburg caravanserai which has also been damaged. Yet, in accordance with the recommendations of the All-Russian Society for the Preservation of Historical and Cultural Monuments, it could have been used as a regional museum.

In Gor'kiy, a 17th Century architectural monument is in an unsatisfactory condition by the fault of the bread baking combine.

Lessee carelessness has brought about the poor condition of some architectural monuments in Moscow as well. This applies to the Rozhdestvo Bogoroditsy Church (beginning of 16th Century) in Staroye Simonovo where Oslyab and Peresvet, the legendary heroes of the Kulikovo Battle, are buried (the church is on the territory of the Dinamo Plant and compressors have been in operation in its premises for decades). The home of the founder of the famous Russian painting gallery, P. M. Tret'yakov, at 1 Golutvinskaya Pereulka, is threatened with destruction.

Unfortunately, restored historical monuments may also be used in a way which could only compromise the positive historical idea of the monument itself. For example, a restaurant offering jazz music and cocktails is located in one of the towers of the Novgorod Citadel. Huge signs and advertizing panels hang on the citadel's walls, demeaning and damaging the face of the structure. Thoughtlessly, iron spikes and brackets are being driven into the stone walls.

Some architectural monuments whose interiors contain valuable works of decorative-applied art, small plastic art objects, or paintings are inaccessible even to specialists.

Similar cases exist in other republics as well. Thus, the unique David Garedzhi and Saarebi architectural-painting 10th-12th Century complexes are left unprotected and are being destroyed in the Georgian SSR. There have been repeated cases of monument damages and even destructions in the Abkhaz ASSR. Abkhaz territory--the ancient Kolkhida--is one of the richest archeological areas in our country demanding particularly careful protection.

The restoration, preservation, and repair of monuments is conducted with the knowledge of the state organs and under their protection and control. The work is paid for, above all, by the users or owners. Historical and cultural monuments negligently used or used not in accordance with the requirements based on their nature, and threatened with destruction or loss may be confiscated from organizations, establishments, or enterprises.

The law forbids the demolition, moving, or changing of fixed historical and cultural monuments. Exceptions to the rule are allowed only by special permission of the USSR Council of Ministers in the case of monuments of all-union importance, or the councils of ministers of union republics in the case of monuments of republic or local significance.

Engaging in the demolition, moving, or changing of a monument, enterprises, organizations, or establishments which have been issued such permits must ensure the legislative stipulations while the respective state organ in charge of monument protection must undertake the scientific study and recording of historical-cultural sites. This norm is of essential importance, for, as a rule, historical monuments wear out far more extensively than contemporary installations and it may happen that an enterprise not interested in engaging in additional work required to bring them up to their proper condition may try to demolish them or "reclassify" them as sites of "obsolete" or "minor" value.

Let us recall that the names of city streets, squares, and historically developed areas are also part of the cultural heritage and that a very tactful and careful approach should be adopted in renaming them. Many good examples of this effect could be cited. We have beautifully sounding names such as Krasnaya Presnya, Krasnoye Sormovo, Shosse Entuziastov, Tselinograd, and so on. Unfortunately, however, different examples exist as well. In the 1920's, for example, occasionally city streets were renamed thoughtlessly and hastily. Today the appearance of names such as First, Second, . . . Thirteenth, Park, Construction, and other impersonal names in the new districts of various cities triggers legitimate perplexity. Meanwhile, historical names of streets and lanes in traditional centers are being renamed.

The law also establishes a procedure for protecting historical and cultural monuments in the course of construction, reclamation, road, and other operations, as well as the possibility of stopping such projects by the state organs should a danger arise in the course of such work threatening a monument or should the rules governing its preservation be violated.

Enterprises, organizations, establishments, and private citizens must ensure the preservation of historical and cultural monuments located on land assigned their use. In the majority of cases such land users are kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Some of them, as a result of their remoteness from major cultural centers, allow a careless treatment of very valuable historical-cultural installations.

The main trouble, nevertheless, remains the negligent attitude toward monuments and the underestimating of their role in educational work. According to the law, enterprises, organizations, establishments, and private citizens who damage a historical or cultural monument or its protective area must bring the monument or its protective area up to its former condition in accordance with the established procedure for monument restoration. Should this prove to be impossible, they must compensate for the losses caused in accordance with USSR and union republic legislation. Officials or other personnel by whose fault enterprises, organizations, or establishments have incurred costs related to the repair of damages are held materially liable in accordance with established procedures.

The cultural standard of society is rising steadily. The people are not only creating new values but also discovering "old" but not aging values, temporarily forgotten or lost by virtue of circumstances.

In this connection, the question of mass cultural-educational work and dissemination of the achievements of mankind's genius rises in its full importance. Great attention is paid to this matter in our country.

The Communist Party follows Lenin's bequest: "Art belongs to the people. It must sink its deepest roots in the very thick of the broad toiling masses. It must be understood and loved by them. It must combine the feelings, thoughts, and will of such masses and elevate them. It must awaken and develop the artist in them" ("V. I. Lenin o Literature i Iskusstve" [V. I. Lenin on Literature and the Arts], Fifth edition, Moscow, 1976, p 657).

The law encourages the development of cultural and educational activities in a variety of ways. One of them is joint work between the Knowledge Society and the All-Russian Society for the Preservation of the Historical and Cultural Monuments. The programs of these social organizations include lecture cycles on cultural monuments. Such lectures are of great positive significance. Series of slides, cartoons, and motion pictures dealing with this topic are produced. However, there are virtually no mass publications on individual works of art. Either organization, Knowledge in particular, with its great publishing facilities, could undertake the purposeful

publication of series of mass pamphlets on monuments belonging to different epochs on the territory of our country, ranging from the Bronze Age to the present.

Museums are another way for the dissemination of cultural values. The law must contribute to the development of museum work in the country, for such work consists not merely of the preservation, collection, and exhibition of monuments but of mass cultural-educational work as well. Museums are not only culture treasuries. They must be scientific research and scientific-methodical centers. The network of museums is spreading. Today even architectural sites have become museum collection objects--in so-called "open sky museums." Museum attendance is growing with every passing year. This clearly proves the steady growth of the cultural requirements of the Soviet people. Museums are the real outposts of cultural construction.

The interaction between museums and schools in the patriotic, moral, and esthetic education of the youth is of tremendous importance. The growing role of museums and the increased complexity of their assignments raise the question of strengthening their material and technical base which, unfortunately, is lagging behind contemporary requirements. A typical shortcoming of most museums is the lack of halls for lectures and demonstrations, and method offices. Their premises are frequently small, and their lighting systems obsolete. Let us cite as an example the mentioned museum-preserve of ancient Russian art imeni Andrey Rublev. Quite famous both in our country and abroad, its purpose is to show a tremendous 800 year period of Russian cultural development in the Middle Ages. The museum has been in existence for over 30 years. It is located on the territory of the former Andronikov Monastery which was proclaimed a historical-architectural preserve as early as 1947. However, half of its premises are occupied by workshops and administrative subdivisions of the All-Union Production-Restoration Combine. The museum is crowded even in its exhibition premises, not to speak of the limited possibilities of its auxiliary premises. There could not even be a question of a lecturers hall as it is non-existent. Yet, the flood of visitors--domestic and foreign--is growing at a headlong pace as is the number of organized trips, requests for lectures with demonstration of exhibits, topic evenings, and so on. What to do? Is it not time to let the museum use all of the monastery's premises. As it is, the monastery is too small to let people object to such "luxury." It would be far easier to find the necessary premises for restoration workshops.

One of the common difficulties in the work of museums is their extremely limited possibilities to issue their own publications. The need for guides, booklets, catalogues, and similar printed matter without which propaganda and mass education work is hindered is universally known. Such publications are of great political and scientific value and, given adequate size editions and quality, their high profitability is obvious.

Let us particularly note among the stipulations of the law, aimed at ensuring the preservation of historical-cultural values, the fact that organizations or citizens are forbidden to collect ancient documentary monuments, or ancient painting or decorative-applied works of art without special permission.

This stipulation is exceptionally important. Collecting is the basis of the accumulation and dissemination of the cultural heritage. Effective measures must be taken to prevent the loss and plunder of monuments. Unfortunately, however, so far such collectioneering has been left without control.

The 16 October 1964 "Instruction on the Discovery, Registration, and Collection of Works of Ancient Russian Art" of the USSR Ministry of Culture must be revised in the light of the law. It is no secret that in recent years the atmosphere which has developed on the subject of monuments of ancient Russian art has not been entirely healthy. That makes their systematic collection and strictest possible registration entirely necessary. Strange though this might seem, the instruction does not contribute to this in the least. For example, it includes the following stipulation: "Works of considerable artistic or historical value must be taken to the storage areas of local museums with a view to preventing their loss . . . Such transfer of discovered works from the territory of the area under study is allowed only by special permission of the oblast culture administration." All this seems proper. However, this stipulation does not take into consideration factual conditions which are that the main cadres of specialists in ancient Russian art are concentrated in the biggest museums and restoration institutions of Moscow and Leningrad and that it is precisely they who are mostly engaged in the search for, study, and evaluation of such works. The leading role of the capital's museums in the scientific coordination and organization of the discovery, collection, registration, and preservation of historical and cultural relics has been omitted. Frequently, under local conditions, there are simply no satisfactory conditions and possibilities for work in this direction and for the proper preservation and exhibition of valuable monuments. That is why this instruction is merely a formality. Yet, as long practical experience has indicated, it could encourage parochial trends. Should the objective need arise, in the interest of a common cause, to take one or another work of art to Moscow or Leningrad, as a rule, the oblast culture administrations oppose the move categorically. Without reducing the rights of the local authorities, the instruction must include specifications which would regulate, in the common interest, the interaction among institutions of the USSR Ministry of Culture and the respective oblast soviet organs.

As a rule, the transfer of works to the capital's museums and their popularization and publicity through central meetings do not reduce but, conversely, increase the international prestige of local culture and enhance the interest in and respect for it on the part of the broad strata of the domestic and foreign public.

So far, because of imperfect administrative rules, for example, that same specialized museum-preserve of ancient Russian art, the only one of its kind in the country which contains Russia's overall medieval artistic heritage with all its periods and directions, is unable to fulfill its purpose entirely. Obviously, the time has come to give it full permission to collect ancient Russian monuments and the right to examine and select ancient Russian works kept in non-specialized museums.

In accordance with the law, a uniform and skillfully coordinated program of activities of capital and local museums, covering all fields of culture, must be elaborated. This requires corresponding scientific centers. Such a center has long existed in the field of manuscript collection and processing --the USSR Academy of Sciences Archeographic Commission. It would be expedient to use its experience in setting up similar centers engaged in the collection of paintings, archeological and ethnographic items, and so on. A system of such coordination centers under the USSR Ministry of Culture or the USSR Academy of Sciences would contribute to the practical implementation of the Law on the Protection and Utilization of Historical and Cultural Monuments.

The newspaper SOVETSKAYA KUL'TURA, the journal CHELOVEK I ZAKON, and other press organs have repeatedly published cases of thefts of objects of art, paintings, archeological and pneumismatic items, and church objects, and attempts to smuggle them across the border into capitalist countries. Naturally, such attempts have been blocked and will continue to be blocked by internal affairs organs. However, something else should be pointed out as well: Many artistic values of historical interest are privately owned. This does not relieve private individuals from liability should they acquire a stolen object or, conversely, should they sell or transfer it to doubtful individuals. This is an action punishable in accordance with Soviet criminal legislation.

Finally, our country has state and people's control organs. It would be useful to extend the influence of such organs also to cover the monuments preservation law.

The 29 October 1976 USSR Supreme Soviet decree stipulates the procedure for the enactment of the Law on the Preservation and Utilization of Historical and Cultural Monuments. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has been instructed to make USSR legislation consistent with this law. The practical workers of administrative and legal organs urgently need clarifications of this kind.

Article 6 contains the general principle governing state control in this area. Obviously, it will be supplemented by subsequent juridical documents which will specify the authority entitled to make practical decisions, to implement them, and to follow their further execution, eliminating obstacles in the execution of the law, and pressing administrative, criminal, or other charges in accordance with USSR and union republic legislations (Article 31 of the law). Here again we should point out in cases of violations of our laws, establishments, public organizations, and all citizens should address themselves to the procuracy.

The law (Article 8) grants public organizations (trade unions, youth organizations, societies for the preservation of historical and cultural monuments, scientific societies, creative unions, and others) and private citizens the right to assist the state organs the implementation of measures related to the preservation, utilization, discovery, registration, and restoration of

historical and cultural monuments and the dissemination of knowledge concerning them. Proper legislative acts should be passed giving them also the right to take proper measures in the struggle against violators of the law.

The Komsomol organizations are called upon to play a tremendous role in the public use of historical and cultural monuments. They have already acquired extensive positive experience in this field. For quite some time student restoration detachments have been successfully working in many republics, krays, and oblasts and their work has been most positively assessed by the local public and the specialists. Obviously, the new stipulations of the USSR Constitution and the passing of the law on the protection of monuments face the Komsomol organizations with broader social tasks. In particular, it would be proper to use in this case the excellent experience of Komsomol patrols. Unfortunately, however, cases of defacing cultural objects, old and new, are still encountered. They are most frequently linked with anti-social actions committed precisely by young people. The Komsomol patrols would represent an important and useful addition to student restoration detachments.

It would be difficult to overrate the significance of this law in our country's cultural life. A special title in the law deals with the attitude of the Soviet state toward the international exchange of cultural values, contributing to strengthening the atmosphere of detente and trust among countries and nations.

From the past we draw inspiration for the present and the future. The fact that the Law on the Protection and Utilization of Historical and Cultural Monuments was enacted precisely during the 60th anniversary year of the Great October Revolution is deeply symbolic. It reemphasized the role and significance which the Communist Party and Soviet state ascribe to the cultural enrichment of the people. Article 46 of the USSR Constitution codified this most important social factor: "USSR citizens have the right to benefit from the achievements of culture." This ensures the universal accessibility of the values of domestic and world culture in state and public funds, the further development and equal placement of cultural and educational institutions on the country's territory, and the advancement of all means for the dissemination and popularization of our fatherland's relics.

5003

CSO: 1802

HISTORICAL MISSION OF THE WORKING CLASS AND THE CONTEMPORARY WORKER'S MOVEMENT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 78 pp 67-80

[Article by V. Zagladin]

[Text] For almost one-third of its second century Marxism is in the center of ideological battles waged by the forces of democracy and progress against those of reaction and regress. However, never before have such battles been all-embracing and intensive as today.

Today, as at the time when the "Communist Party Manifesto" appeared, the question of the historical mission of the working class has been, and has remained one triggering particularly sharp and heated discussions. This circumstance is not amazing, for the problem under discussion is, in the final account, the central socio-political problem of our epoch. Its solution is of determining significance to the future of all mankind.

I.

Emerging in the arena of historical action, each social class has been called upon to resolve its own entirely specific problems whose content has been based on the objective requirements of the respective period of social development. Such tasks were faced, naturally, by the bourgeoisie itself--the last exploiting class in mankind's history.

K. Marx and F. Engels discovered the nature of these tasks, i.e., the essence of the historical mission of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie fulfilled it in its essential features during the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries.

History teaches us that whenever one or another exploiting system exhausts its possibilities to promote human progress the time for the removal, the elimination of this system comes. Should it continue to exist, nevertheless, for a certain, not to speak of longer, period of time, as a rule the consequences of this act are quite dangerous. This is particularly important in the case of our epoch in which capitalism has historically outlived its usefulness.

In fact, at the very beginning of the 19th Century, the internal faults of the capitalist system, related, above all, to the exploitation of an ever greater mass of people by an insignificant (and even smaller) handful of big owners of productive capital, were manifested to their fullest extent. These faults were empirically exposed even in the works of some bourgeois ideologues of the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th centuries and, subsequently, even more convincingly and vividly, in the works of the utopian socialists.

Ever since the working class emerged in the historical stage as an independent force and when, consequently, the internal antagonisms within the capitalist system had already reached a certain ripeness, it became ever more obvious that bourgeois rule provides ever lesser stimuli for social development, hindering it to an ever greater extent. Marx perspicaciously noted this circumstance in his study of initial economic crises at a time when capitalism was still following an ascending line.

Subsequently, at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries, as capitalism grew into imperialism, the old social order began to convert ever more clearly into chains paralyzing the further development of mankind. This was convincingly proved by V. I. Lenin.

Finally, today, when imperialism has fully revealed all its faults and its entire dangerous potential, it becomes entirely obvious that the further existence of the capitalist system represents no longer merely a hindrance and even not only a tremendous obstacle to the development of mankind. It is a growing menace to the very further existence of mankind.

The full strength of this fact is revealed in the following basic aspects:

1. Continuing to develop technology, modern capitalism is also leading to a big rotation of the conditions governing the development of the main productive force of society--the working class. A considerable share, nearly nine percent, of the proletariat in developed capitalist countries now constitutes a virtually permanent unemployed army. Its size is continuing to grow and, something particularly important, almost 40 percent of the unemployed are young people, people who, hardly having left school, are unable to engage in any kind of useful and productive activity. The socioeconomic, not to speak of the moral-political consequences of this are assuming a truly tragic nature;

2. Contemporary capitalism hinders the normal and free development of the peoples of the former colonial empires. It is trying, by all possible means, including the fire and the sword, to preserve social orders which, taking South Africa as an example, in their extreme manifestation are nothing but simple genocide--the elimination, the destruction of entire tribes and nationalities;

3. Through its predatory practice and unrestrained exploitation of productive forces, capitalism brings about the factual undermining of the very conditions of human existence. Capitalism destroys the environment favoring

the human habitat. It brings about the exhaustion and destruction of natural resources required for mankind's further existence and refuses to display any somewhat serious concern for their preservation and restoration;

4. The most important, the main thing is that capitalism is the source of a constant military menace. Under contemporary conditions this also means the threat of a world thermo-nuclear war which could bring about the destruction of life on our planet.

It is precisely imperialism that is responsible for the continuing and ever growing scope of the arms race which is currently costing the world about \$400 billion, and the labor of over 50 million people. Now, in accordance with the decisions passed at the Washington NATO meeting, over the next 10 to 15 years the military expenditures of the members of this bloc will be increased by yet another \$80 billion.

All this also means that under contemporary conditions problems related to the historical mission of the working class which is, precisely, the elimination of capitalist rule and ensuring the universal victory of socialism--the system fated to save mankind from the threat created by imperialism and to take it to the path of all-round progress--assume even greater importance.

II.

The conclusion which Marx and Engels drew as early as the "Communist Party Manifesto" on the role of the working class and the nature of its historical mission has been subjected over the past 130 years to the violent attacks of bourgeois ideologues. This is not astounding, for the acknowledgment of the accuracy of this conclusion would mean the acknowledgment of the inevitability of the failure of the capitalist system. Yet, no supporter of the capitalist rule would accept this.

It is important to note something else as well. The determining feature of the overwhelming majority of non-Marxist and, even more so, anti-Marxist currents which have appeared within the labor movement following the publication of the "Communist Party Manifesto," is that, like the bourgeois ideologues, they continue to reject, if not in form then in essence, the conclusion of the historical mission of the working class. They continue to deny the role of the proletariat in the development of human society.

Let us point out that today's representatives of extreme leftwing currents have not gone too far beyond Bakunin and his supporters. The difference, a substantial one, is that since that time history has made them take a strict examination and proved their real worth. The "cultural revolution" in China promoted by the Maoist leadership through typically extreme leftwing methods, and presented as just about the "most democratic movement of the masses," turned, in fact, into the humiliation and suppression of the working class, bringing about the ever greater abandonment by the Chinese leadership of the principles of proletarian, scientific socialism. What does

the current practice of the "red brigades" in Italy and their kinsmen in the FRG and other countries prove? Hiding behind the red color of the proletarian flag, using occasionally extreme leftwing slogans, today's conspiratorial revolutionaries are doing everything possible to prevent the working class from waging an effective struggle for democracy and socialism. These are not proletarian but anti-proletarian, lumpen-proletarian forces in terms of political behavior, even though they may recruit some of their supporters from the working youth. It has been particularly clearly proven today that if you veer left you could go right.

Like the "left" wing of the worker's movement, the rightwing opportunistic elements, in turn, while acknowledging verbally the historical role of the worker's movement, in fact totally reject the historical mission of the working class.

In fact, is the Bernsteinian rejection of socialism as the objective of the labor movement not such a negation of the role of the proletariat and of its struggle? Are the attempts on the part of modern Bernsteinists such as J. Ellenstein in France, nothing but the same attempt to reduce the struggle for socialism to reforms which would merely touch up capitalism, or to "radicalize" the changes such as the male-female, superiors-inferiors, or competence-incompetence ratios?

However, today the rightwing currents in the labor movement and their views have also been subjected to a lengthy historical test. It indicated that under the leadership of rightwing opportunistic leaders the working class is incapable of fulfilling its historical mission. For decades Bernstein's followers were in power in different countries. Frequently they were able to do something to improve the material situation of the workers. However, they never came even close to socialism.

The attempts to deny the justice of the Marxist-Leninist conclusion of the universal-historical mission of the working class have failed in the past and are failing today, for this conclusion accurately reflects the factual laws of the historical process and its real requirements. In fact, the theory of the founders of scientific socialism on the role of the proletariat in the development of the world is nothing but the scientific summation of the factual situation, objectively based on the very nature of the capitalist system, its basic social contradiction, and the very nature of the working class.

We know that the main contradiction within capitalist society is the contradiction between labor and capital, i.e., between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The struggle between opposites within this contradiction determines, in the final account, the fate of capitalism. It is a source of progress in the period following the establishment of the capitalist system and until its fall.

As a parasitical class owning the productive capital and living at the expense of the labor of millions of toiling people, the bourgeoisie acts as the reactionary and conservative side of the basic contradiction within the capitalist society. It is precisely its domination, the rule of private ownership, that is the main objective obstacle on the way to social progress.

Conversely, labor, i.e., the proletariat, is the revolutionary, the leading side in said contradiction. This is determined by the fact that the working class is the main productive force of society, the main bearer of the trend toward production socialization. Yet, production socialization is precisely the main material base of the inevitable socialist offensive (see V. I. Lenin, "Poln Sobr Soch," [Complete Collected Works], Vol 26, p 73). It is precisely this objectively determined leading revolutionary position of labor in the "labor-capital" contradiction that expresses the Marxist formula of the historical mission of the working class.

In the past this Marxist conclusion was rejected by bourgeois ideology frontally, immediately, and unreservedly. Now, when Marxism-Leninism has become a powerful and influential force, matters are somewhat different. Today even some bourgeois scientists are prepared to acknowledge the "relative accuracy" of its conclusions applicable to the past, the 19th century. At the same time, they claim that today they have become totally wrong, obsolete, and no longer topical. Why? Answering the question, they claim, for example, that today capital is no longer merely the bourgeoisie (since, for example, not only the big but the petit bourgeoisie, some employees, and even some workers own stock). They also say that labor no longer represents the working class alone, since today most people within society are hired labor.

Naturally, it would be stupid that relations between labor and capital today maintain the same "classical" aspects described, for example, by Engels in his work "The Position of the Working Class in England." Despite all changes in the forms of such relations, however, their nature has not changed.

It is true that today shares are owned not only by members of the bourgeoisie or the bourgeois intelligentsia as during Zola's century, but also by a certain percentage of the petit bourgeoisie and even a certain number of workers. However, both theoretical studies and practical experience have confirmed that this has made no change in the very nature of social relations within contemporary capitalism. Furthermore, in many respects this nature is manifested today far more clearly and repulsively than before.

Thus, a fact universally acknowledged, including liberal-bourgeois science, is that in recent decades the already extreme social inequality in capitalist society has intensified even further. Today 75 to 80 percent of the national wealth in developed capitalist countries are owned by no more than 5 to 7 percent of their population. This is a basic fact. Furthermore, essentially, it reflects the main trend followed by the capitalist society in its social development, formulated by Marxism as early as the "Communist Party Manifesto."

Now as to the other side of the matter--the fact that the working people today are not only workers. Indeed, it is unquestionable that today hired labor accounts for practically 70 to 90 percent of the population in the capitalist countries. However, the basic factors characterizing the social

development of the contemporary capitalist society, in our party's view, is the transformation of the working class in the developed capitalist countries into the absolute majority of their active populations. Thus, according to the estimates of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of International Workers' Movement, in the United States the share of the working class in the active population rose from 72.3 percent in 1950 to 77.0 percent at the beginning of the 1970's; the respective figures are from 63.8 to 74.8 percent in the FRG, from 79.4 to 79.6 percent in Britain, from 56.6 to 68.0 percent in France, from 53.4 to 66.0 percent in Italy, and from 36.4 to 61.0 percent in Japan.

These two social changes put together, i.e., the ever greater social differentiation within society, on the one hand, and the conversion of its majority into the proletariat, on the other, are precisely the basic aspects of the dominating social development trend, confirming, yet once again, that the conclusion of the historical mission of the working class is indeed correct and that it truly expresses the vital realities and needs of contemporary social progress.

III.

Let us now consider the argument which questions the current veracity of the Marxist-Leninist conclusion of the historical mission of the working class, since today not only it alone but all other social strata are being exploited by the monopolies and are involved in the struggle against them.

It seems to us that it is important, considering this problem, to bear in mind the conflict between the monopolies and the rest of society they oppress, a contradiction which developed at the imperialist stage of capitalism, even though closely related to the basic social contradiction within capitalism is not its equivalent.

In fact, the basic social contradiction within capitalism ("labor-capital") combines and pits one against the other only the two basic classes within the capitalist society, i.e., the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

The "monopolies-people" contradiction is a different matter. In this case part of the bourgeoisie (and not the entire bourgeoisie as in the first variant) is pitted against the entire remaining part of the nation, i.e., not only against the working class and the other detachments of hired labor but against some of the owners, against part of the exploiting classes.

One of the problems triggering energetic discussions is that of the stages of transition to socialism. Are there two stages: Democratic and anti-monopoly, followed by socialist, or a single stage, the stage of transition to socialism, in the course of which both democratic and socialist problems are resolved? The answer to the question is not simple. Yet, obviously, above all, it is always historically specific: The situation prevailing in

a given country could suggest one or another solution. Yet, we believe that, whatever the variant, we must not ignore the fact that the two types of contradictions, rallying in the course of the struggle of social forces of different natures, lead to various types of fighting coalitions and, above all, presume different outcomes of the struggle.

Thus, whereas the "labor-capital" contradiction finds its solution in the socialist revolution, the solution of the "monopoly-people" contradiction presumes democratic changes, i.e., the elimination of monopoly ownership and its conversion into state ownership and, at the same time, the development of the type of power structure in which only one thing would be mandatory: Preventing monopoly capital from gaining control.

In order to imagine more clearly the difference between the first and second contradiction and between the first and second major stages of socialist change, let us add one more thing: Socialist revolution, i.e., the final solution to the "labor-capital" contradiction inevitably leads to the elimination of the domination of private owners in society and to the creation of a ruling social ownership of productive and working capital. The solution of the "monopolies-people" contradiction is the result of democratic and anti-monopoly changes: The property belonging to the monopolies converted into state property even though not socialist but democratic, with a very likely participation in the government of representatives of non-monopoly private capital.

We must point out that whereas monopoly ownership covers a considerable percentage of the national output it represents a very small part of the sum total of existing enterprises. Following anti-monopoly changes most enterprises are left to their owners--average and small capitalists. Obviously, this fact as well largely determines the nature of the society following the elimination of monopoly rule.

In this case it must be taken into consideration that to the working class the existence of precisely average and small private enterprises is particularly burdensome in many respects. It is known that it is precisely at such enterprises that exploitation is fiercer. It is precisely here that labor conditions are harder. Therefore, we should not exclude the fact that under the conditions of already eliminated monopoly rule the class struggle in average and small enterprises would assume a rather sharp nature. Since state enterprises would remain in the hands not of a socialist but of a kind of pre-socialist state, to a certain (rather substantial) extent capitalist type exploitation will be retained at state enterprises as well. Therefore, they too will remain within the realm of a very intensive class struggle, the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie.

As we pointed out, the various detachments of revolutionary forces, including the various communist parties, resolve differently the problem of whether or not the revolutionary process in their country will be developed in two stages or as a continuous forward movement in the course of which,

at a given point, a qualitatively new revolutionary leap would occur. However, regardless of the type of development of the revolutionary process, obviously, it is important to define precisely, at any given time, the nature of events under way and their class substance. In fact, should anti-monopoly changes be considered a socialist coup d'etat, the struggle for true socialism, i.e., for a society without private ownership and exploitation, a society of social justice, would be greatly harmed, and the very ideal of socialism would be belittled and emasculated. On the other hand, if at a time of ripening socialist coup, one or another revolutionary force would limit itself to slogans calling for partial democratic reforms, it would clearly miss the opportunity to make this qualitative leap in social development, thus postponing the socialist revolution for an indefinite period.

This clearly indicates that the very fact of involving the overwhelming majority of the population in the capitalist countries in the struggle against the monopolies at the present stage neither eliminates nor undermines the thesis of the historical mission of the working class as the main force and vanguard of the struggle against the domination of private ownership, against capitalist power, and for socialism. This confirms even further the fact that the struggle against the monopolies today can not be essentially successful if the working class does not play in the struggle the role of vanguard, a hegemonistic role.

True, objections such as the following may be heard: If various social and political forces participate in the struggle against the monopolies, obviously, all these forces are equal. If such is the case, could the question of vanguard, hegemony, or leading force be raised?

Naturally, the partners within a political coalition are autonomous and equal. Obviously, there are no command forces in such a coalition. However, a command force is one thing and a vanguard, another. In this case the vanguard is the force which, by virtue of its very nature, is objectively capable, in the social meaning, to go farther and accomplish more than the other participants in the struggle. On the other hand, it is the detachment which is ideologically better prepared and politically more initiative minded, which offers a program of action indicating the way to the entire coalition. Life has repeatedly proved that the working class and its revolutionary political party are such a vanguard force.

Naturally, whereas from the social viewpoint the working class is the hegemonistic force objectively, by virtue of its nature, from the ideological and political viewpoint matters are determined by the subjective factor--the initiative and activeness of the workers themselves, the communists above all. Both in the past and the present the history of the workers' movement has provided a number of examples of the way one or another political party which rushes ahead at any given stage may, subsequently, lose its vanguard role and surrender its positions should it adopt an erroneous political line or should it proclaim slogans which do not stimulate the movement forward but either lead it aside, in the wrong direction, or hinder it. All this reasserts the significance of a class-consistent political line.

IV.

Therefore, at the democratic stage of the struggle, the stage of the struggle against monopoly rule, today as well the working class is objectively destined to fulfill its historical role--a hegemonistic role, the role of a vanguard, of a leading force. To an even greater extent this applies to the stage of the immediate struggle for socialism.

True, in this connection, occasionally the following objections are raised: Since, it is claimed, in our time not only the working class but the ever greater majority of other social strata is in favor of socialism, in a way socialism loses its "exclusive" role. The need for working class hegemony and for the exercise of working class power, even though allied to other classes and toiling strata, is eliminated.

In his time, soon after the October Revolution, Lenin formulated the idea of an alliance among the representatives of science, the proletariat, and technology which, as he said, no dark force could resist. It was a question precisely of the struggle for socialism and not against the monopolies, i.e., not of the first, democratic stage of revolutionary change but of the second stage. Did Lenin assume that the idea of such an alliance would eliminate the question of the historical mission of the working class and the abandonment of its hegemony in the struggle for socialism? Naturally, no!

In fact, to begin with, even though with the passing of time science is becoming an ever more important production force in society, we should not forget that, in the final account, the practical application of its achievements would be impossible without the most active and fruitful participation of the working class in this process. It is precisely it, as the basic productive force of society, that remains the main element ensuring the merger of science with production within a single entity.

It would be pertinent to recall at this point that at the end of the 1950's and beginning of the 1960's, following the development of production automation, many bourgeois and reformist ideologues faced the question of the "decline" of the role of the working class and the fact that machines would replace the worker who, as a result, would become unnecessary while priority will be given to the scientist, the creator of machines. A great deal of time has passed since. Today we can clearly see that the automation process, like the other processes related to the practical utilization of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution, is not resulting in the least in the destruction of the working class or the reduction of its role. Conversely, it is precisely the scientific and technical revolution that is reproducing with new strength and in new, far greater scales, the functions of the working class, expanding its possibilities.

Secondly, speaking of this, we must mention yet another process characteristic of our time. Under the influence of the scientific and technical revolution the proletariat itself is gradually changing. Its educational, skill, and cultural standards are rising. This greatly strengthens the social positions of the working class and, particularly, its role and possibilities as the vanguard of the alliance with science and technology.

In the socialist countries we speak of the appearance of an entire stratum of workers-intellectuals. Essentially, it is a question of people who have blended labor with science within themselves, so to say, within their own personality. Unquestionably, the future belongs to this process, for it is precisely it that opens the way to the birth of the member of the communist society who combines the qualities of philosopher and practical worker, a high cultural standard, and the practical ability to apply acquired skills and knowledge.

Thirdly, and finally, bearing in mind the developing alliance among the proletariat, science, and technology as an important force in the struggle for socialism in the capitalist countries, we can not fail to emphasize that, unquestionably, the working class plays a leading role in this alliance on the social and, particularly, the ideological level.

As the bearer of scientific knowledge, the intelligentsia takes this knowledge to the working masses. It would be impossible to belittle the significance of this function. However, any, even the most progressive, ideas acquire a practical meaning and bring to light their true value only in the course of the practical activities of the working class.

On the other hand, it is widely known that frequently the outlook of the ruling class, i.e., the bourgeoisie, strongly influences the ideas formulated by the intelligentsia in the capitalist society. From this viewpoint as well, consequently, the fruitfulness of the intelligentsia's theoretical and political elaborations can not be guaranteed outside its ties with the labor movement.

Bearing all this in mind, the obvious and unquestionable conclusion is that the alliance among the proletariat, science, and technology, discussed by Lenin, not only does not presume any belittling of the role of the working class but, conversely, becomes one of the contemporary forms for the implementation of its historical mission. In other words, it becomes one of the methods through which the working class achieves its hegemony in the revolutionary process.

In this connection, it would be suitable to recall that the considerable part of Antonio Gramsci's legacy deals precisely with such problems. His ideas on the importance of ensuring an alliance between the working class and the intelligentsia, the importance of developing an intelligentsia of the working class, and so on, are particularly important today.

V.

It is entirely obvious that the implementation of the historical mission by the working class, i.e., the destruction of the old, bourgeois society and the creation of a new, socialist society can not fail to be a relatively lengthy process. In practical terms it covers the entire history of the workers' movement from the moment of its appearance to its creation of a

communist society and to the elimination of classes as such. It is understandable that in the course of this process, the specific content of the revolutionary-transforming activities of the working class, in the course of which it resolves its problems, becomes steadily enriched while the methods used for the implementation of this historical mission change, improve, and advance.

In the initial stages of the workers' movement, the working class had just become a "class for itself," the struggle for the implementation of its historical mission included the following basic elements:

Steady advance against exploitation on the part of capitalism and for improvements in the material status of the working people;

Steady and ever more energetic participation in the struggle for democracy and for its expansion;

Ever more noticeable and definite support of demands for the elimination of national oppression in all its ways and forms;

Steady and ever more energetic actions against aggressive wars and imperialist foreign policy and for a democratic foreign policy and peace.

Naturally, following the appearance of the first socialist state in the world, followed by a system of such states, the content of the struggle waged by the international working class for the implementation of its historical mission broadened and became richer. The factual building of a new society became the most important element of this struggle.

Starting with securing, despite the opposition of the entire imperialist world, of the victory of the revolution and socialism in a single separate country, in Soviet Russia, the working class subsequently achieved victories in other countries, in countries which had reached different development levels, countries with different traditions and characteristics. Today 15 countries are members of the world's socialist family. Many other nations are entering or preparing to enter this path. This confirms, again and again, that the conclusion of scientific socialism regarding the universal-historical mission of the working class was correct and that it is precisely this conclusion that is of essential importance to the proper understanding of the contemporary stage in the world's development.

Naturally, the victory of the revolution is merely the first step, the initial stage in the establishment of the new social system. The working class would not only fail to accomplish but would betray its historical mission if, leading one or another nation to the path of socialism, it were to abandon the defense of the socialist gains or, by virtue of one or another accidental circumstance such as, for example, for the sake of the abstract ideas of non-existent above-class democracy, would agree to return to the bourgeoisie the power it took away from it as a result of the long independent class struggle waged by the proletariat.

Socialism is such a great achievement and major step on the way to social progress that withdrawal from it or refusal to defend it for whatever reasons are things which revolutionaries can not understand.

This includes another matter, namely that of defending existing socialism by the revolutionaries and working people of countries where the new system has not as yet become reality. As we know, currently a certain debate is taking place within the workers' movement on this subject. The views expressed include assertions that now, when world socialism has become a considerable force, the other detachments of the workers' movement are not "obliged," so to say, to support it. Leaving aside the reasons for such positions, reasons which, clearly, deserve a specific study of each specific case, let us merely point out one thing.

Naturally, no one could "oblige" one or another party or organization to support the socialist countries. However, should one or another detachment of the workers' movement aspire to replace in its country capitalism with socialism, regardless of the selected way of struggle for the new system, and regardless of its concept of this system, i.e., of socialism in its country, in our view, it can only support socialism, either victorious or under construction in other countries; it can not but strive to strengthen its positions in the world, for in the final account, the positions of any detachment of the workers' movement, wherever it may be operating, are unquestionably strengthened as a result of the strengthening of factually existing socialism. Conversely, such positions become unquestionably weakened if the positions of world socialism in one or another of its units become weakened. In this case this is not a question of sympathy or antipathy. It is not a question of unity or disparity of views. It is a question of class reality, a question of ratio of forces, and of the willingness or unwillingness to strengthen the positions of the fighters for a socialist future throughout the world.

Speaking of this, we are not thinking in the least of belittling the significance of the workers' movement in the capitalist world and its activeness. The peoples of the socialist countries value exceptionally highly the activities of their class brothers in the capitalist world. They see in them their friends, their fellow workers, their allies in the struggle for common objectives. The struggle over the working class in developed and the Latin American countries and the growing labor movement in Asia and Africa are of tremendous historical significance. They are making a major contribution to the contemporary development of the world. However, the ratio of forces between the working class and capitalism in any part of the non-socialist world does not exist separately. It exists only in connection with the existence and role of the world socialist system.

In fact, one could easily imagine the difficult situation in which the workers in all capitalist countries would find themselves had world capitalism not been opposed today by world socialism. In such a case the exceptionally important factor which restrains the bourgeoisie would be eliminated and the

entire power of the imperialist military machine, police, and administration would immediately be hurled against the communists and democrats, thus hindering the entire universal revolutionary process.

That is precisely why, objectively, concern for strengthening the positions of world socialism must be a concern shared by all other components of the workers' movement. This, in particular, represents today one of the important tasks in the struggle for the fulfillment of the historical mission of the workers' movement on earth.

Furthermore, after the appearance of world socialism, its consolidation, and its conversion into an entire system of countries, the conditions of the struggle waged by the working class in the capitalist countries could not fail to change and, indeed, did so. The working class gained new possibilities both on the level of the struggle against capitalist exploitation and the struggle for democracy and for national independence. The working class has moved ahead quite tangibly in its activities in all these directions.

Let us particularly mention, in this connection, the substantial changes which have taken place in the realm of the struggle waged by the international working class for peace and against the threat of war.

The close connection between the question of war and peace and the struggle for democracy and socialism is well known as a whole. As early as the 19th Century, Marx and Engels, followed by outstanding theoreticians of scientific socialism such as A. Bebel, K. Liebknecht, R. Luxemburg, and others emphasized that the struggle against the threat of war is an inseparable component for the struggle for democracy and socialism. Today we speak of something bigger. With modern military technology which has long had the capability to destroy all life on earth several times over, the struggle against war is not simply a component of the struggle for socialism but, rather, a necessary prerequisite for the success of this struggle, for the outbreak of a world thermo-nuclear war could hurl mankind as a whole far back.

Thus, on the one hand, by virtue of its nature imperialism increases the danger of war, urging on the arms race and developing ever new means for killing people. On the other hand, by virtue of its nature, the workers' movement is gaining strength to oppose this imperialist policy and the arms race and to reduce and, subsequently, eliminate the danger of a world war.

Consequently, the struggle on the matter of war and peace becomes today one of the main manifestations of the basic social contradiction within capitalism--the contradiction between labor and capital.

As we know, a substantial change in the situation regarding the problem of war and peace became obvious in the 1970's, when the cold war began gradually to yield to detente. It was precisely the existence of world socialism,

its strengthening, and its policy of peace, together with the activity of the workers' movement and, above all, of the communist parties, marching in the vanguard of the democratic and peace-loving forces, that were the basic factors ensuring the progress of detente.

The increased activeness of the workers' movement in the struggle for peace and disarmament could be proved quite clearly with the following four examples. It is a question, first of all, of the initiative-minded proposals recently submitted by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries on matters of determination of the arms race; second, the decisions of the Berlin Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe, whose second anniversary was celebrated at the end of June; third, the recently held Helsinki Conference of the Socialist International on disarmament problems--the first measure of its kind in the history of the Socialist International; fourth, the recently held congress in Prague of the World Federation of Trade Unions, in which representatives of practically all detachments of the international trade union movement participated and which also expressed itself firmly in favor of restraining the arms race.

These four examples, taken together, show that, in our time, the workers' movement as a whole or, speaking more cautiously, the majority of the workers' movement, its overwhelming majority, is in favor of terminating the arms race. This fact could be of decisive significance. We deliberately use the word "good" for, in order for it to assume a decisive factual significance, the verbally expressed unanimity must be converted into unanimity of action. From a recognition of the need to put an end to the arms race we must convert to joint purposeful actions. The forces of the international working class and the workers' movement are such that it could really be successful in the struggle against war should it display the necessary persistence and consistency.

VI.

The contemporary progress achieved by the international workers' movement in its struggle for the implementation of its historical mission reemphasized the accuracy of Marx's and Engels' conclusion that, liberating itself, the working class will liberate all mankind as well.

Indeed, the struggle waged by the working class completes the tremendous epic of the struggle waged by the people's masses for the elimination of an exploiting order in general, for the factual elimination of the rule of private property, for surmounting the alienation of man, and for his full emancipation. However, the working class could become a force which would wind up this struggle only because it proved to be itself a class of an essentially new nature.

As early as the "Communist Party Manifesto" and, subsequently, in some of their other works, Marx and Engels proved that all exploited classes in pre-capitalist systems, actively fighting their oppressors, nevertheless faced very narrow socio-historical horizons. Their immediate social interests were quite limited.

Being the oppressed class of the capitalist society, and fighting for its own liberation, assuming the power, the working class does not try to perpetuate its domination and turn into an exploiter. From the very beginning the proletarian ideas stipulated a struggle for objectives far exceeding the limits of the existence of the strictly labor movement. The interest of the working class--above all a main interest such as the elimination of the rule of private ownership--express the main interest of the majority of the working people and exploited classes. The ideal of the working class is the creation of a classless society in which every person would acquire the necessary possibility for all-round development; this is a universal ideal whose implementation is the essence of worldwide social progress.

Naturally, in the initial stages of development of the workers' movement, it was a question, above all, of the objective coincidence of the class interests of the proletariat with the interests of all mankind.

However, on the one hand, in the course of time, as the working class and its possibilities grew and, on the other, in the course of the process of the proletarianization of the entire society, and the conversion of hired labor into the overwhelming social majority, the realm of coincidence of the class interests of the proletariat with those of the other population strata broadened. Correspondingly, it became possible for the universal nature of the class interest of the proletariat to be revealed ever more completely and extensively.

True, a major stipulation must be made here. Some forces within the labor movement are appealing, above all, to the universal or international nature of the interests of the working class. However, they conceive this and, in their practical activities proceed from the fact that it is necessary to achieve the cooperation between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, i.e., between the exploited and the exploiters. Understandably, this approach is radically wrong.

In fact, as historical experience has convincingly proved, the working class becomes ever more successfully the spokesman for the interests of all mankind the more successfully it struggles for its class interests, for the best guarantee for the solution of universal problems is, in the final account, the victory of the working class as a class, i.e., its elimination of the capitalist ruling system as such.

An adequate example of this is provided by the socialist countries where it was precisely the victory of the working and the creation of a system of power by the working class and its allies that made it possible successfully to resolve problems of international, universal nature as well. Through the example of the socialist countries, the Soviet Union above all, the working class is proving in practice, in fact, that it not only does not aspire toward perpetuating its class rule but, furthermore, it does not even aspire to prolong its existence as an autonomous separate class. In our country the working class took the course of surmounting class differences and

achieving the social homogeneousness of a society which will also be a prologue to the future elimination of classes. Successes in the building of socialism and in the achievement of a socialist democracy made it possible to convert from a state of dictatorship of the proletariat to a state of the whole people which, in turn, will ensure the preparation of conditions for a conversion to a communist social self-administration. The USSR Constitution --the constitution of the socialist state of the whole people--adopted last year represents a new major and essentially important step in this direction.

Naturally, we repeat, the working class discloses the universal meaning of its historical mission to its fullest extent only after its class victory and, on the basis of this victory, only under the conditions of socialism and the building of communism. However, there are certain areas in which its role as spokesman for the interests of all mankind can be clearly seen as of now, not in the socialist countries alone, but on a worldwide scale, including in the capitalist countries. Here, yet once again we return to the question of war and peace.

Acting as the most consistent and resolute enemy of imperialist wars and as the most systematic fighter against the threat of a thermo-nuclear war, the international working class thus defends, clearly and consistently, the interests of all mankind, its future, and its vital prospects as a whole.

The working class was the first to enter the arena of the autonomous class struggle in the first third of the 19th century. It has gone a long way in the course of 150 years of active efforts for the promotion of its daily, current, and long-range objectives. It is precisely this progress that ensured the progress of all mankind.

To a tremendous extent economic progress was determined precisely by the labor of the working class and was secured by it. Today the international working class accounts for three-quarters of the world's public product.

The working class ensured to a considerable extent socio-political progress as well. It was precisely the working class that created the world socialist system. It was precisely the working class in the capitalist countries that accomplished tremendous social changes. It gained democratic rights and freedoms which the bourgeoisie would have never granted freely had it not waged against it such an adamant and persistent struggle.

Within that period the spiritual and ideological development of mankind was also determined by the workers' movement to a decisive extent. The ideals of socialism have become today the leading ideals of mankind. This occurred only as a result of the conscious adamant struggle waged by the working class for the implementation of its socialist ideals and by virtue of the fact that it gave to the peoples its attractive example.

In other words, the ascension of mankind to the peaks of social development over the past 150 years has been, and is being ensured by the struggle waged by the working class for the implementation of its historical mission. There neither is nor could there be a doubt that the success of the working class in this great undertaking will lead to the completion of the transition of mankind from capitalism to socialism and will turn a new, communist page in the history of our entire planet.

SOME PROBLEMS OF THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 78 pp 81-91

[Article by Ye. Primakov, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member]

[Text] One of the basic features of contemporary world progress is the irreversibility of the process of national and social liberation of the peoples of the former colonial empires. The main and determining direction of the changes in the countries which were born on the ruins of such empires or which abandoned the path of semi-colonial dependence was marked by the assertion of national sovereignty, elimination of feudal land ownership, development of the state sector, nationalization of foreign enterprises, and growth of national self-awareness. The peoples of a number of liberated countries are engaged in the implementation of profound domestic socioeconomic changes by raising the slogan of a socialist orientation. The positive role of the liberated countries in international life is growing and the front of the fighters for peace and universal security is strengthening.

Meanwhile, within the framework of this historical process with its clearly marked future, in recent years two diametrically opposite trends have developed: The radicalization of changes in a number of liberated countries, and adjustments in some of them.

Quite characteristically, the completion of the process of elimination of the colonial system, marked by the crash of the last colonial empire--the Portuguese--led to the replacement of the former Portuguese colonies with anti-imperialist systems which are directing the development toward scientific socialism. This was largely due to the fact that the victory of the national-liberation movements in the former Portuguese colonies was preceded by long years of adamant struggle in which cadres of revolutionaries grew and tempered, revolutionaries who considered the future of their countries as organically linked with the destinies of the other components of the world's revolutionary process--the comity of socialist states and the international workers' movement. The Ethiopian victory won and the revolutionary-democratic leadership which assumed the power took the path of profound social changes under socialist slogans. A historical victory was won by the revolutionary

movement in Afghanistan. Revolutionary changes intensified in the People's Republic of Congo, the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the People's Republic of Benin, Tanzania, Algeria, Libya, and others.

At the same time, however, the axis of power shifted to a different direction in Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and Bangladesh. A withdrawal from a socialist orientation took place in Egypt. The reaction strengthened its positions in Sudan. Rightwing coups d'etat took place in some other developing countries. What is the reason for such processes? To answer this question, obviously, we should consider certain new internal and external conditions governing the development of the liberated countries and the dialectics governing the interconnection and interaction of such conditions.

I.

The development of the liberated countries¹ is complicated by a number of factors, largely predetermining its twisting nature and, in many cases, resulting in a retreat from already obtained socioeconomic changes. "In a number of liberated countries," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, emphasized in the Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th Party Congress, "a complex process of demarkation between class forces is taking place and the class struggle is growing. This is manifested in a variety of ways. New and progressive changes have taken place in socialist oriented Arab, African, and Asian countries. There also exist countries whose development has gone further along the capitalist way. Some systems and political organizations which had proclaimed socialist objectives and were promoting progressive changes were subjected to the strong pressure of domestic and foreign reaction."

It could be said that the common feature of current circumstances in the liberated countries is a class differentiation more clearly visible than in the past. The gap between the bourgeoisie and the toiling population strata in those among them which followed the path of capitalist development has broadened.

At the same time, essentially external conditions have introduced certain changes in the nature of the bourgeoisie of the developing countries, the big and middle bourgeoisie above all. It is possible to speak of the preservation and development in new forms of the contradiction between the local bourgeoisie as a whole and foreign monopoly capital. However, this was paralleled by the development of another trend--the rapprochement between this bourgeoisie and the imperialist monopolies. This trend is intensifying. It is the result of the influence of common processes in the world's capitalist economy which the developing countries are a part. Under the new circumstances cooperation between local capital and the sharply energized multi-national corporations (MNC) became important forms of capital concentration and centralization in a group of liberated countries and, consequently, of the development of the bourgeoisie.

Suffice it to say, that within the framework of the capitalist world, the MNC control over 90 percent of all foreign investments. Today the output of the foreign branches of American corporations exceeds by over 400 percent the value of all U.S. exports. Despite the fact that the relatively increased share of industry in the developed countries within the realm of MNC activities has been a characteristic feature in recent years, in terms of absolute indicators the operations of such monopolies in the developing countries have been growing steadily.

Presently the raw material multi-national corporations, i.e., those which supply the industrial centers of the capitalist world with raw materials, fuel, and agricultural produce, have been emphasizing the processing of primary goods locally, close to the sources of raw materials of the developing countries, in connection with the ecology crisis in the developed capitalist countries and, particularly, following the nationalization of a number of raw material extracting enterprises in the liberated countries. The building in such countries of power intensive, material intensive, and "polluting" enterprises aimed at supplying the markets of the developed capitalist countries brings the MNC considerable profits.

Another direction in MNC activities in the developing countries is the creation, locally, of import replacing production facilities. As a rule, they are oriented toward the local market. In the past 10 years MNC activities based on international intrasectorial production specialization has become widespread. The low wages of local manpower are most important to such MNC branches which, essentially, have been converted into shops. Their operations in various countries are united through the production-commercial activities of the head companies.

All these directions followed in MNC activities in the developing countries presume a close cooperation between foreign capital and the local bourgeoisie and, naturally, certain changes in its structure as a result of such cooperation. Such changes will be inevitably increasing in the future.

Two of the most widespread of MNC activities in the developing countries are the establishment of mixed companies involving the participation of national capital or contractual relations with it while preserving the foreign nature of MNC branches operating in such countries. Both forms enable the multi-national corporations to earn huge profits by plundering the natural resources and the merciless exploitation of manpower in the developing countries. MNC practices contribute to the tying of such countries to the peripheral part of the world's capitalist economy, preserving and increasing their scientific-technical and technological dependence on the developed capitalist countries.

The MNC always try to deal with big local capital which has not only the necessary funds but the respective political influence as well. A study made by India's ECONOMIC TIMES indicated, for example, that 80 percent of the 172 corporation agreements with foreign companies were made by the biggest Indian monopoly groups. Such cooperation makes the big bourgeoisie in

the developing countries the junior partner of the MNC. The coincidence of its interests with those of foreign capital prevails over conflicts. It is not astounding that Birla and Tata, the Indian monopoly groups, call for expanding relations between India and the Western monopolies, insisting on so-called liberalization of investment legislation which, at present, does not allow MNC participation in banking, plantations, and other more profitable economic sectors. A similar attitude toward multi-national companies is noted among the enriched feudal-bourgeois upper crust of Middle Eastern oil-producing countries.

A certain deformation is occurring in the ranks of the middle bourgeoisie as well. To one or another extent a considerable segment of this bourgeoisie finds itself involved in cooperation with foreign capital. Characteristically, many MNC, in turn, try to involve the middle bourgeoisie of the developing countries in such cooperation. For example, 25 multi-national corporations, including Borden, Dow Chemical, and others, founded in the Latin American countries ADELA, a joint company, to encourage mixed enterprises involving the participation of the middle and even part of the petty national business. Similar tasks have been assigned to Pika, in Asia, and Sifida, in Africa, companies based on foreign capital.

Many members of the middle bourgeoisie act as MNC intermediaries or marketing agents and frequently increase their income through "commissions" earned for operations and deals which are frequently illegal and are made at the expense of the government as well. This segment of the bourgeoisie, either removed from direct production, or having never participated in the production process, has been contaminated by the typical "neo-mercantile" mentality of cooperation with the monopolies of the developed capitalist countries. In some developing countries some of the officials, the bureaucratic machinery, comes close to and, frequently, blends with the neo-mercantile bourgeoisie.

We should point out, however, that the middle bourgeoisie in the developing countries, excluding the openly neo-mercantile elements, and, to an even greater extent, the petit commercial-industrial bourgeoisie, has retained its anti-imperialist aspirations. Yet, it is very important to emphasize that at the present time the national character of the middle bourgeoisie is expressed essentially in the struggle less against the domination of foreign capital than for achieving better conditions for cooperation with it.

In some cases the increased regulatory role of the state in terms of MNC activities, particularly in matters of sharing technology, exceptionally important to local capital, has been influenced by middle business. Earning huge profits from their operations in the developing countries which they consider, to an ever greater extent, as part of their overall "multi-national" production process, in a number of cases the MNC are gradually "easing" the conditions governing their activities within certain limits, naturally. Thus, whereas 10 years ago practically all foreign companies tried to establish total control over locally created companies, now the MNC are

frequently satisfied with a lesser share of participation in mixed enterprises. Here, however, the tendency of foreign capital to adapt to local conditions leads to the ever greater coincidence of its interests with those of the big and middle bourgeoisie of the developing countries. This coincidence is achieved at the expense of the broad people's masses, including the petit bourgeoisie, which are subjected to merciless exploitation and which assume all the burdens of a deeper involvement of the developing countries in the world's capitalist economy.

Naturally, this does not mean that in the liberated countries following the capitalist way there are no longer local business groups which consider foreign capital a direct competitor, a rival. However, the rivalry between the group of the big and middle local bourgeoisie and foreign capital is being supplemented, ever more frequently, by their cooperation.

The situation in the countries following the capitalist way does not radically change as a result of the development of the state sector. In some of them, as in the past, it remains an obstacle on the path of controlled foreign capital investments. In other cases, however, it leads rather to a certain change in the forms of activity of this capital and, occasionally, to what is referred to as "partnership," i.e., to cooperation between nationalized or newly created state enterprises and the MNC. The state directly participates in mixed companies with foreign capital.

As a result of the active measures taken by a number of developing countries, essentially in the 1970's, they were able considerably to restrict the operations of foreign raw material monopolies. For example, the Arab countries have assumed nearly total control over foreign oil companies on their territories. However, in countries following the capitalist way foreign capital did not terminate its operations as a result of such essentially progressive measures which made the redistribution of profits possible between foreign companies and developing countries. Ever more frequently partnership and contractual agreements are concluded between them. In some cases a foreign company undertakes to carry out the entire operation by instruction and on behalf of an established national company.

Meanwhile, the increasing share of the profits earned by such countries is advanced by them for new projects involving the participation of foreign capital. As the NEW YORK TIMES MAGAZINE wrote in November 1976, over a three year period Saudi Arabia will pay American companies the huge sum of \$55 billion for the establishment of an infrastructure. In Saudi Arabia industrial construction U.S. corporations have been given 80 percent of all newly concluded contracts over the current five-year period, and the entire 100 percent in the construction of heavy industry projects. The state of Saudi Arabia grants foreign companies tremendous facilities: It advances 50 percent of the cost of the projects in interest free loans repayable over 12 years, leases land against a symbolic payment, supplies water and electric power at lower rates, offers customs-free facilities and levies no income tax for periods ranging from five to 10 years, and allows the transfer abroad of all profits and, in some cases, of its own capital as well.

The process of class differentiation which, under contemporary conditions, is linked with the trend toward a rapprochement between the local bourgeoisie and the foreign monopoly capital, is reflected in the domestic political situation of the individual developing countries, shifting to the right the center of gravity in their political life. In this case, unquestionably, the relative organizational and political weakness of the proletariat in such countries, and the underestimated need for the factual unification of all progressive forces show their influence.

Yet, this trend is temporary. In any case, it does not determine the future domestic political development of the liberated countries. The shifting of the power axis to the right inevitably leads to the intensification of the class struggle. Its results will be influenced to an ever greater extent by the creation and development of a working class and the strengthening of its relations with the toiling peasantry and the democratic intelligentsia.

II.

Together with the intensified process of class demarkation in the liberated countries, the nature of their twisting and disparate development is affected by the law of uneven development of contemporary capitalism. It is important to emphasize that V. I. Lenin included within the realm of manifestations of this law all parts of the world's capitalist economy, including its "periphery" which, at that time, consisted of colonies and semi-colonies and which is represented today essentially by the young states. " . . . Capitalism is developing unevenly and objective reality shows, along with highly developed capitalist nations, a number of nations which are economically rather weakly or entirely underdeveloped," he wrote ("Poln Sobr Soch" [Complete Collected Works], Vol 30, p 112).

The Leninist formulation of the fact that the law of uneven development leaves its mark on relations not only between world capitalism, on the one hand, and the group of developing countries, on the other, but also in relations among such countries themselves, is of exceptional importance from the methodological viewpoint and, particularly, in the study of the present situation in the liberated countries. At the turn of the 20th Century, when Lenin's analysis was made, as we know, capitalism was expanding particularly rapidly in some "overseas" countries which had either not been subjected to direct colonial oppression or which Lenin classified as colonies where the "surplus" population from the mother country had moved, countries such as Canada, Australia, or South Africa. Lenin also noted the exceptionally fast growth of capitalism in a number of countries with colonial systems--a one-sided, distorted, yet, nevertheless, fast growth of capitalist relations which, as we know, resulted, in a number of countries, to the establishment of a monopoly bourgeoisie.

The conditions which developed as a result of the crash of the imperialist colonial system favored, as a rule, the growth of capitalism in the liberated countries. The effect of the law of uneven development intensified the

differentiation within this part of the world's capitalist economy which, today, a number of countries have outstripped the entire group in terms of the overall growth rates of the national income, gross per capita domestic product, capital investments, and labor productivity. Such countries include the oil producing countries in the Middle and Near East and individual Latin American countries. At the other end, in 1971, the United Nations listed a group of 25 of the least developed countries based on criteria such as lowest per capita income, minimal literacy levels, and very poor industrial sector. In 1975 the United Nations added another four countries to this group, thus raising its total to 29.

The uneven development of the liberated countries was drastically aggravated as a result of the structural crises within capitalism which spread, particularly in the 1970's, over entire areas of the world's capitalist economy and were described as raw material, energy, monetary, and ecological crises. Their consequences were the exceptionally rapid and spasmodic growth of the national income of individual developing countries, petroleum producing above all, the fastest industrial development of a number of liberated countries, and the accumulation (the "overaccumulation" in the impossibility to use it domestically as a result of inadequate domestic market capacity) of capital and its export, including exports to developed capitalist countries, and structural changes in the economy created by the transfer to the liberated countries of ecologically "polluting," labor, energy, and material intensive production.

Thus, from 1973 to 1976 the income of oil-producing countries members of OPEC tripped from \$42.2 billion to \$132.5 billion. This increase was even higher in some OPEC members. A boom in capital investments was triggered on the basis of this growth. Saudi Arabia, whose 1977 oil export income totalled \$40 billion intends to invest \$142 billion in the course of its "five-year development plan" (1975-1980), i.e., an amount four times the size of all capital investments of the entire group of developing countries in 1970. It would be quite logical to assume that far from the entire amount could be turned into capital considering the shortage of skilled and, in general, of hired manpower, and the weak development of the infrastructure. Nevertheless, the possibility that Saudi Arabia would take a considerable leap in its economic development is clear. A similar, if not an even more contrasting picture, taking into consideration a considerably higher development level, was achieved by Iran in the preceding period.

The group of oil-producing countries--Saudi Arabia, Iran, Kuwait, and the United Arab Emirates--is becoming a major capital exporter. Whereas in 1970 the overall volume of Saudi foreign investments totalled \$893 million, by 1976 it had increased by a factor of 55, reaching almost \$50 billion. According to MIDDLE EAST REPORTER, an information bulletin, by 1981 Saudi Arabia's foreign assets may reach \$133 billion, thus providing an annual income of \$10 billion.

As estimated by the American treasury department, between 1972 and April 1977 the OPEC members invested over \$31 billion in the U.S. economy; within that time \$41 billion were invested in the Western European economy and about \$10 billion in international financial institutions. Capital exports from the developing countries to the developed capitalist states are an essentially new phenomenon characteristic of the 1970's. Not to mention the fact that it is becoming a source of rapidly growing income for some (true, isolated) liberated countries, the export of capitals is becoming a new rather effective means used by imperialist circles to tie this important part of the developing world to the main economic centers of contemporary capitalism.

Most Western researchers are predicting an increased unevenness in the development of the liberated countries in the 1980's and the 1990's. According to the American scientist V. Leontiev, the highest growth rate over this period will be achieved by the oil-producing countries where, it is expected, the processing industry will expand at more than twice the speed than that in the African and almost twice as rapidly as the Asian non-petroleum producing countries. According to the same estimates, between 1970 and the end of the 20th Century, internal capital investments will rise in absolute terms by a factor of 104 in oil-extracting countries, compared with 17-22 in Latin American countries and 6-11 in Asian and African (non-petroleum producing) countries.

III.

The nature of the law of uneven development at the stage of monopoly capitalism, discovered by Lenin, consists, as we know, not only of noting the uneven growth of different production facilities, industrial sectors, and entire countries, and not even of substantiating its inevitability. Lenin showed the way this inevitability itself influences policy. He determined the dialectical interconnection between uneven economic and political development. Under the conditions of the division of the world into two conflicting sociopolitical systems and the steady change in the ratio of forces in favor of world socialism, the contradictions developing among capitalist countries do not mandatorily grow into wars as in the past. However, the effect of the law of uneven development leads, as in the past, to the formation of various power centers within the capitalist world, the rivalry and struggle among which determine their daily relations. The centripetal trend, based on production internationalization and the policy of opposition to world socialism, merely changes the form of manifestation of the contradictions among capitalist countries. As a whole, however, it can not surmount civil strife, rivalry, and struggle, eliminating them, and reducing to naught inter-imperialist or, more generally speaking inter-capitalist contradictions in general.

The dialectics of the interaction of uneven economic and political development is manifested in the group of developing countries also in the creation of individual "power centers"--a kind of "subimperialist islands." While still members of this group in terms of basic criteria such as relatively

underdeveloped production forces, particular position in the world's capitalist economy, mixed economy, objective need to participate in the movement for the democratization of the existing international economic order, and so on, at the same time, individual liberated countries are gradually converting to a new level of relations both with developed capitalist and other liberated countries.

A greater element of interdependence is introduced in relations between such individual countries and developed capitalist countries despite an overall preservation of the total inequality of the "partners" in terms of economic development, and ability to utilize the achievements of scientific and technical progress. Such interdependence is converted into a more noticeable involvement of such countries not only with the world's capitalist economy but with imperialist policy as well. Naturally, in this case the area of non-coincidence between their interests and the interests of the developed capitalist states remains and may even increase on individual subjects.

Promoting an expansionist policy toward the liberated countries within the micro-regions surrounding them, such individual countries are also promoters of the policy of American and Western European imperialist circles. This is greatly assisted by the intensive process of their rearmament with most modern types of the latest military hardware supplied mainly by the United States. Saudi Arabia is an example in this case. In recent years it has purchased from the United States weapons totalling about \$5 billion.

The economic and political maneuvering of the local reaction, whose bulwark the mentioned "sub-imperialist islands" become, represent a serious danger to the progressive regimes in the Middle East and the national-liberation forces of the area. In recent years the foreign economic and political activities of Saudi Arabia have become particularly important on this level. Let us point out that in addition to its huge income derived from oil, whose monopoly handler is the ruling upper crust of the country, the intensification of its role in the Arab world was also triggered by the weakening of Egypt's influence, after G. A. Nasser's death, and the participation of Saudi Arabia in the oil offensive during the October 1973 war (increased oil prices, temporary boycott of the United States and the Netherlands, who helped Israel, and a lowering of oil extraction). The implementation of such "petroleum actions," regardless of their objective significance, was skillfully used by the Saudi Arabian leadership to strengthen its positions within the group of Arab countries. Becoming the center of gravity of all reactionary forces in the Arab world, Saudi Arabia is channeling its efforts directly toward the struggle for the counter-revolutionary degeneration of Arab regimes which have proclaimed their socialist choice. This is clearly exemplified by the conspiracy prepared by Saudi Arabia against the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen aimed at a counter-revolutionary coup d'etat in that country.

Anti-socialism and anti-communism is Saudi Arabia's banner. The main target of attacks at the present stage--here the interests of the Saudi rulers coincide with those of imperialist U.S. and Western European circles

--are the many-faceted friendly relations maintained between progressive Arab countries and the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries which have historically proved to be the main and reliable ally of the Arab peoples striving for progressive socioeconomic and political changes in their society, and the elimination of the severe consequences of the 1967 Israeli aggression and of Tel Aviv's continuing expansionist course.

The maneuverings of the Saudi reaction is backed by the imperialist circles who are contemplating the hindering of the unification of the Arab countries who oppose the line of firmly tying the Arab world to the West. Through the adoption of "sanitizing" measures in the Arab world, the imperialist West would like to ensure itself against any future accidents, particularly bearing in mind the fact that until the end of this century this area will remain the main supplier of the basic energy resource of the developed capitalist countries--petroleum. Judging by current trends, demand for oil will not only not decline until the year 2,000, as was presumed by some experts until recently, but will, conversely, increase.

Following its defeat in Indo-China, the trend described as the "Guam" doctrine or the "Nixon Doctrine," proclaimed in 1969, became even stronger in the tactic used by American imperialism in its struggle against the revolutionary forces of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. This doctrine calls for relying on the local reaction in the struggle against the national-liberation movement, and its drastic energizing with U.S. support. This would include military aid but exclude direct involvement of American land forces in operations.

In an effort to implement the stipulations of the "Guam" doctrine, the American ruling circles ascribe great importance to so-called "control" of international conflicts. As early as the 1960's views became popular in the United States according to which it should actively participate in "controlling" disputes among developing countries with a view to preventing them from reaching a global level, and directing their development in a way which would maximally secure American political interests.

Intergovernmental conflicts and crises promoted by imperialism and its agents are taking place in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Many of them are related to the boundaries of the former colonies, retained from the colonial past. Others are related to the location of raw material and natural resources and their transportation across the territories of neighboring countries. Others again are related to the aggressive policies of the ruling circles of some countries allied with imperialism. Conflict situations in southern Africa are caused by the rule of a racist minority in the Republic of South Africa and Rhodesia who are trying, with the help of imperialist circles, to preserve the apartheid system which is not only keeping in a state of racist slavery the predominant majority of the population of these countries but is threatening the security of neighboring African states.

Along with "preventive" measures aimed at obstructing the national-liberation and revolutionary activities of the peoples, U.S. imperialism uses conflict situations directly for striking at already existing progressive systems.

The many years of American diplomatic maneuvering in the Middle East may be used as an example. Supporting the expansionist Israeli leadership and arming it with the latest military equipment, U.S. imperialism is trying to strike, through Israel, at the Arab national-liberation movement, and bring down the progressive regimes which are developing under anti-imperialist slogans. The essence of American imperialist policy in the Arab countries is the effort to weaken their ties with the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist comity. The American press did not conceal the fact that U.S. credits and loans to President Sadat and promises of an influx of American private capital in Egypt, which were not kept, as it were, were dictated by the desire to alienate the Arab Republic of Egypt from the USSR. This explains the policy of "rapprochement" between the United States and some other Arab countries, coordinated with Saudi Arabia.

The United States not only uses but provokes a number of conflicts, inspiring their development into crises. Examples of this are found in its activities against the People's Republic of Angola. The United States and the other imperialist countries are trying to benefit by fanning the conflict on the Horn of Africa. The United States and some of its NATO partners helped to arm Somali whose regular forces invaded Ethiopian territory.

The liberated countries are going through a complex development stage. Profiting from some objective processes, imperialism is trying to hurl them back, and to erect obstacles on the path of the revolutionizing of the peoples. However, the course of social development is merciless and can not be turned back. The ascension of all mankind, initiated with the victory of the Great October Revolution, toward progress, independence, freedom, and socialism has become a law in the dynamics of history.

FOOTNOTE

1. In scientific and political publications the group of developing or liberated countries is frequently conventionally described as the "third world." This definition does not properly express the nature of the factually existing common features shared by these countries rallied not only by their historical colonial past but by an entire series of current common objective indicators: Low level of economic development; membership within the world's capitalist economic system, holding a particularly "assymetrical" position of dependence on economically developed capitalist countries; and a mixed economy.

The existence of common subjective, ideological, and political factors, which have become particularly tangible of late, is very important in the classification of the liberated or developing countries as a relatively homogeneous group. They also include the policy of non-alignment and the struggle for the democratization of international economic relations and for a new economic order.

However, all this, put together, does not allow us, without contradicting the scientific concept of such common features, to describe such countries as some kind of a "third world," allegedly coexisting on a parallel basis with the capitalist and socialist worlds. We should proceed from two basic aspects in defining the comity of developing countries: The nature of the contemporary world divided into two conflicting sociopolitical systems, and the nature of the contemporary historical epoch characterized as transitional from capitalism to socialism. This predetermines the objective impossibility for the liberated countries to develop in some kind of "third" direction.

Already now the group of developing countries includes countries following the capitalist way as well as countries with a socialist orientation. At the same time, a gradual "erosion" of this group could and should take place both as a result of the subsequent affiliation of individual developing countries with the world socialist system as well as the affiliation of some of them with the group of developed capitalist countries. Naturally, such "erosion" is a lengthy historical process. Its duration, however, in itself is no proof whatever that the group of liberated countries is developing or could develop in the future on the basis of laws different from those determining as a whole the nature of our epoch and the trends of social progress.

5003

CSO: 1802

FUTILE SEARCH

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 78 pp 92-102

[Article by D. Gvishiani, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member]

[Text] In the final quarter of the 20th century the socioeconomic development of mankind is characterized by radical and revolutionary changes in social relations. The profound qualitative changes not only in material production but in all other areas of human activity are taking place under the influence of the scientific and technical revolution, posing, more urgently than ever before, the problem of perfecting the social organization of society.

The Great October Socialist Revolution marked the beginning of a new era in the history of our planet. The establishment and successes of the socialist social system, the steady growth of its power, and its ever increasing influence on world developments and international relations represent today the main direction of social progress.

The attractive force of socialism becomes even greater against the background of the cataclysms which are shaking up the capitalist world. Along with the aggravation of traditional capitalist contradictions, under present conditions capitalism is facing new and even more complex problems. Economic and overproduction crises are paralleled by monetary, energy, raw material, and ecological crises. Inflation has assumed unparalleled scope and duration.

All this clearly proves that the state-monopoly system is unable to control efficiently socioeconomic development processes. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, noted in his report at the 25th Party Congress, "today everyone can see that one of the principal myths created by reformists and bourgeois ideologues has been refuted--the myth that capitalism today is able to avoid crises. Capitalist instability is becoming ever more obvious. Promises to 'restore the health' of capitalism and create within it a 'society of universal prosperity' have clearly remained unkept." The bourgeoisie is doing everything possible to be in step with the times, using a variety of methods of economic control. To a certain extent this stimulates economic growth but, as the communists predicted, is unable to void capitalist contradictions.

The deep ideological and political crisis within capitalist society, which struck its power institutions, political parties, and moral foundations, is reflected, directly or indirectly, in contemporary bourgeois organization and management theories.

The present condition of research in the field of organization and management in the capitalist world is characterized, to an even greater extent than in the past, by the variety of views, schools, and trends which frequently argue among themselves. The metaphoric description of this condition provided by the American professor Harold Kuntz, who described the situation as the "management theory jungle," retains its accuracy.

As we know, the basic bourgeois concepts of organization and management have been studied and criticized in detail in the works of a number of Soviet researchers and scientists and specialists in other socialist countries. On this basis, it seems to us, as a whole extremes allowed in the past in assessing the theory and practice of capitalist production organization and management, expressed, on the one hand, through the underestimating of the critical study of the experience of capitalist countries in this field and, on the other, the overrating of this experience and the adoption of an uncritical attitude toward it, have been eliminated.

The Marxist-Leninist view on the nature of bourgeois management theory and practice is based on the Marxist concept of its double nature under capitalist conditions in which, on the one hand, management is a type of work objectively required in any social production process and, on the other, a "work of supreme supervision," based on the exploitation of the social labor process, and its alienation from the means, objects, and products of labor and labor activity itself. On this basis, a truly scientific approach to said theory and practice presumes a differentiation, first of all, among the characteristics and features which determine the objective need for management as a special function arising from the very nature of the social labor process and organically belonging to it and, secondly, the characteristics and features which reflect the specifically capitalist form of implementation of this function as a labor exploitation function.

This was precisely the way V. I. Lenin formulated the task of the critical study of Taylorism and of its practical application in socialist industry. He emphasized the need to distinguish within the "Taylor system" scientific achievements related to the very nature of big public production and the norms which govern the requirements of capitalist exploitation.

Lenin's assessment of Taylorism is of basic methodological significance in the current study of bourgeois theories as well.

A strict critical approach must be adopted to capitalist experience, creatively assessing that which is positive and universally important in it while, at the same time, firmly rejecting anything triggered by the specific features of capitalism and which, naturally, could not be applied in the practice of socialist construction.

The study of the capitalist theory and practice of production management presumes a consideration of the striving of bourgeois authors to present the capitalist form of organization of the production process as universal rather than related to a specific socioeconomic system. Bearing this in mind, K. Marx wrote: "Only bourgeois narrow-mindedness which considers capitalist production forms absolute and, consequently, perpetual natural production methods could confuse the question of what is productive labor from the capitalist viewpoint with the question of what labor in general is productive or what is productive labor generally speaking . . ." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch" [Works], Vol 26, Part 1, p 400).

Considering the bourgeois theories of organization and management we must bear in mind that they represent an inseparable component of bourgeois ideology, found in the great variety of aspects of the deep spiritual crisis experienced by contemporary capitalist society. Their characteristic feature is a subjectivistic, a supporting direction, the desire to arm bourgeois propaganda with new arguments which would "substantiate" the viability of capitalism. At the same time, the bourgeois theories of management are directed toward the ideological unification within the capitalist class and at surmounting the contradictions among the various bourgeois groups, intensified in the course of capitalist concentration and centralization.

The theoreticians of capitalist management are trying to study the factual products and difficulties of private ownership production management and are formulating ways for their solution. Against a background of growing social pessimism in the capitalist world and lack of faith in the future, many supporters of the contemporary bourgeois organization and management theory are trying to formulate "optimistic" utopias concerning a "scientifically organized" capitalist society.

Engaging in the scientific study of the various concepts of capitalist "management science," we must bear in mind that such concepts reflect--even thought frequently through distorted bourgeois awareness--first of all the objective processes inherent in contemporary production in general; secondly, the specific laws of capitalist production and its current stage with its specific contradictions and, thirdly, the class interpretation of its laws by bourgeois theoreticians. Obviously, all these aspects are closely inter-related and their separate consideration can not provide an overall idea of the latest bourgeois organizational and management concepts.

Facing growing economic and social difficulties and the further aggravation of the competitive struggle, the capitalist companies are feverishly seeking ways and means to increase the efficiency of management activities, lower costs, and raise profits, using for such purposes the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution. Consequently, our attitude toward the contemporary theory and practice of capitalist organization and management could not be exclusively negative but must represent their comprehensive critical study which would enable us to note and single out individual positive aspects reflecting objective trends of scientific and technical progress and the technical and organizational socialization of production inevitable under capitalist conditions as well (and, in the final account, fatal to it).

Ever more actively the USSR and the other socialist countries are engaging in scientific and technical cooperation with the bourgeois states in this important area as well. Examples may be cited of effective bilateral cooperation in the solution of specific problems related to the mechanization and automation of management activities, use of systems methodology, and joint development of individual projects. Multilateral cooperation is being developed as well. For example, very effective work has been accomplished by the International Institute of Applied Systems Analysis set up in Vienna five years ago. The activities of this non-governmental organization involves the participation of scientists and specialists from 17 countries, both socialist and capitalist. The institute deals with topical problems of the management of big systems of various types using the latest scientific methods and management equipment. Along with the study of methodological problems of systems analysis, on the basis of a comprehensive and interdisciplinary approach the institute works on projects of global and universal importance in fields such as power industry, water resources, environment, human settlements, and others. Obviously, the scientists and specialists working at the institute have different ideological views. However, their joint work is effective by virtue of the fact that from the very beginning an orientation toward specific positive results was adopted. Naturally, this is achieved not at the cost of some ideological concessions but the determination of problems of universal interest and whose joint study yields practical results.

The scientific consideration of similarities and differences between the socialist and capitalist systems of social production organization and management presumes the profound analytical and dialectical study of the subject. In this case a purely empirical approach, limited to the study of a specific situation regardless of the general laws which determine individual phenomena would be inadmissible. In this connection let us emphasize the following: Usually, in considering differences and common aspects in production organization and management under socialism and capitalism, attention is drawn to the fact that on the enterprise, plant, and factory levels major similarities exist in the solution of many technical and organizational problems compared with higher levels or on the scale of the entire society. This observation is partially true. However, it should not conceal the basic differences existing between the socialist and capitalist management systems at all levels without exception, including enterprises and their subunits. Such radical differences are based on the opposite natures of the public and private systems of ownership of productive capital.

Therefore, in the course of the critical study of capitalist theories and practices of organization and management, we must specifically bring out the aspects corresponding to the objective needs governing the functioning of social production in general and, consequently, manifest themselves in an essentially similar way in different socioeconomic systems and specific capitalist forms. It is precisely such a methodological principle that is the basis of most Soviet studies on the problem.

Considering the contemporary trends of development of the bourgeois theories of organization and management, we could note that their lack of a single scientific concept used to interpret the general laws governing social production is compensated by increased empirical studies of economic activities of individual capitalist companies and studies of the various aspects of economic functioning. The dominant significance of the so-called "situational theory" or "situational approach," which is assuming an ever more important position in the contemporary bourgeois theory of organization and management, is becoming ever more apparent.

This approach confirms the desire to increase the amount of practical return on research in the field of organization and management, reorienting them toward the practice of management activities. The "situational approach," writes R. Mockler, one of the reporters of this current, "introduces reality into the theory of management and the training of managers. An excessive number of management theoreticians tended in the past to develop simplistic general theories, thus losing contact with the reality of factual management work" (R. J. Mockler, "Situational Theory of Management," HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW, Vol 49, No 3, 1971, p 151).

Therefore, the appearance of the "situational approach," is openly and directly linked with the limited effectiveness of existing bourgeois organization and management theories which are proving their groundlessness in the face of the ever increasing complexity of management practice. Businessmen are criticizing management theories for their "impracticality," their "alienation from the real world," and their incapacity to serve as specific work tools.

Explaining the reasons for such moods, Mockler points out that the specific situations and conditions under which the manager operates are so varied that contemporary management concepts have proved to be unsatisfactory from the viewpoint of business practitioners who are seeking in the theory a guide to utilitarian results. "This may sound heretical to the old guard of management theoreticians," he writes. "Personal experience, has taught me that there are few (if at all) fixed management "principles" aimed at universal use. It is precisely as a result of this that a number of past studies and publications dealing with management problems, which have frequently provided such principles, have been unable to give the managers adequate practical guidance" (ibid, p 146).

The spreading of the "situational theory" is yet another proof of the methodological crisis of the bourgeois theory of management. Naturally, it would be totally unjustifiable to deny the importance of the study of the specific conditions under which one or another organization operates. A specific approach to the study of any phenomenon including problems of organization and management, is a mandatory prerequisite for scientificity. In this sense the criticism of dogmatism and over-simplification of "traditional" management theories is largely justified from the positions of the "situational approach." However, the pitting of a specific situation against a general trend and of the specific to the general is entirely groundless. A study

limited merely to a consideration of specific facts and daily developing situations, not armed with a general methodology for their scientific study, and avoiding substantiated theoretical summations of a broader and all-embracing nature, compared with a specific circumstance, would inevitably slide to the positions of empiricism.

Yet, it seems to us, it would be erroneous to cultivate a blank negative attitude toward the "situational approach," regardless of the empiricism and the positivistic-pragmatic interpretation of the theoretical principles of organization and management which are predominant in it. Even though in a conflicting way, a number of efficient aspects are contained in the "situational approach." The desire to raise the practical value of theoretical elaborations, and to convert the abstract-methodological interpretation of organizational and management principles, traditionally characteristic of many schools and directions, into the elaboration of principles which would make it possible to resolve under specific circumstances one or another organizational problem will, unquestionably, contribute to upgrading the practical significance of research in this field.

This pragmatic orientation of the "situational approach" is being applied ever more extensively in the elaboration of one or another specific plan for improving the efficiency of organizational structures, restructuring the management system at specific sites, and managerial training and retraining. Thus, in the 1950's and 1960's, students attending various management courses in the United States were given an idea of the various types of organizational structures (linear-staff, hierarchical, functional, regional, and so on). Proper attention was focused on their mechanism of action. Even though it was acknowledged that each type structure could be suitable only under specific conditions, it was precisely this aspect, i.e., the adaptation of structures to the specific requirements of a given organization, that was ascribed secondary importance. Currently, radical changes are being planned in the approach to this matter. As Mockler emphasizes, "the companies discovered that traditional organizational methods have proved themselves unsuitable for developing structures which would enable them to resolve these (i.e., new--the author) problems. Traditional organizational structures with their rigid separation of responsibilities and rights and strict hierarchy proved themselves too inflexible to be consistent with the requirements of a dynamic practical environment . . ." (ibid, p 147). The new approach in both research and the system for training management cadres is manifested in the fact that the emphasis began to shift to the study of the factual circumstances and specific situations of one or another company and, on this basis, the development of a specific, one-of-a-kind if necessary, organizational structure consistent with specific conditions and requirements.

The development of the "situational approach" in the United States and other Western countries clearly indicates the objective limitations in the application of scientific knowledge to the solution of organization and management problems in a capitalist society. Yet, practical requirements dictate

business the need to look for one or another solution to ever more complex organizational problems. It is precisely on this basis that the "situational approach" is created with its strictly empirical and practical orientation. Characteristically, this trend is being developed against the background of an increasing number of recently made frank statements by bourgeois authors to the effect that regardless of partial successes achieved through "latest methods," a management science has not existed, still does not exist, and is, in principle, generally impossible, for management is, above all, an art which can not obey rules. This essentially irrationalistic concept is expanded by empirical arguments: Reminders of the variety of conditions, situations, and problems encountered by any contemporary manager.

Quite typical in this respect are the views of G. Odiorne, an American management specialist, famous for his "existential manager" concept. After studying an entire system of "situational limitations," within which the factual capitalist manager must operate, Odiorne reaches the simple conclusion that a scientific theory of management is impossible, and that most circumstances surrounding such a manager are simply "not suitable to any theoretical analysis" (G. S. Odiorne, "The Management Theory Jungle and the Existential Manager," ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT JOURNAL, Vol 9, No 2, 1966, p 111), and that all the views of management theoreticians, dealing essentially with the professional manager sheltered by the big corporations, would be unable to withstand a test should their realm of application be broadened even slightly. According to Odiorne, the concept of "management science" according to which the manager controls events, is naive. The most he is capable of achieving is to "adapt to circumstances." Odiorne considers the possibility to surmount the crisis of the "scientific management theory" on the basis of philosophical irrationalism which reveals a totally nonsensical interpretation of the chasm of existence, indicating the way to the prevention of "scientific prejudices." However, regardless of the fact that this author reduces to the level of absurdity all moral and existential activity of the manager, nevertheless, he draws the attention to very important facts usually unmentioned in bourgeois literature. His views most clearly show that capitalist reality, with its typical uncontrolled market, uneven and spasmodic production development, and fierce competitive struggle, can yield to organization and streamlining to a very insignificant degree.

Pointing out that management theoreticians acknowledge the existence of areas in which the movement is developing "blindly," Odiorne emphasizes that they are obviously underestimating the determining role of such areas and factors. "We can neither plan nor avoid them. We can only fight them and, in the final account, be either defeated or turn to the destruction of one another," he writes (ibid, p 111). Odiorne, who supports such relations entirely, combines such a sober acknowledgment of the antagonistic nature of capitalist relations with identifying the bourgeois way of life with general human conditions as a whole. For this reason he absolutizes the essential impossibility to develop a bourgeois management science as a result of "situational limitations," and opposes the possibility that a scientific theory of management in general could be formulated.

The views supported by Odiorne and some other theoreticians with a similar approach are a manifestation of most extreme judgments in terms of the possibilities of the contemporary bourgeois theory of organization and management.

"The basic purpose of the situational approach," writes Wolfgang Staehle, the West German follower of this school, "is to avoid the use of general economic theories based only on partially substantiated postulates . . . He begins with the study of factual problem situations determined by the totality of cause and effect relations, following them by an interpretation in the light of the formulated targets (values). The situational approach leads to the formulation of situational hypotheses and, in the final account, to so-called situation theories. His main topic is that there is no universally suitable and single optimal method of action but, rather, a number of alternative solutions one of which could be acceptable in a specific situation" (W. H. Staehle, "Situational Approach to Management," *MANAGEMENT INTERNATIONAL REVIEW*, Vol 16, No 3, 1976, p 59).

The purpose of the "situational approach" is to elaborate alternative concepts, structures, and strategies, formulating them in models of decision-making with a view to selecting the most acceptable solution among the other alternatives in a set of specific conditions. Situational studies presume the thorough empirical study of comparative variants of an approach to the solution of problems, the study of external influence factors, study of consequences of alternate action programs, and so on.

The development of this trend, to the extent to which it is related to systems analysis and to modelling the decision-making process through the study of alternates, in accordance with the objectives, tasks, and specific characteristics of a given situation, is, unquestionably, of scientific interest. The only question is the following: Should such a sensible instrument for specific research be elevated to the rank of a universal theory?

Is this not an attempt to fill a theoretical vacuum?

Let us note that even though many American theoreticians are trying to present the "situational theory" as a "discovery," essentially they have long become widespread, particularly among the representatives of the "empirical school." The "concrete situations" method taught for many years at Harvard University and in various other universities and business schools, is essentially not different from what is loudly proclaimed as the "situational theory." The novelty exists not on the conceptual level but in the application of the latest methods of analysis and simulation modelling in the analysis of specific situations.

Situational approach concepts have been developed with the "scientific management" school, starting with F. W. Taylor's works. The attempts to consider the "situational theory" as a rallying concept and to convert it into a basic method for managerial thinking, and the growing influence of this theory over a large number of research areas and over management training and retraining are new.

Considering the contemporary trends in the development of the bourgeois theories of organization and management, we must establish both the subjective and objective factors which determine them. In this connection, we must discuss in particular a problem of basic, of determining importance to understanding the evolution of said theories.

In the course of their development they are inevitably subject to certain modifications dictated not only by acquired knowledge and their improvement but the broadening of the range of research problems themselves caused by objective changes in the conditions under which the project under study operates. Traditionally, ever since their appearance, the concepts of "scientific management" of capitalist production have been aimed at the study of problems related to the internal organization of enterprise activities. Even though, to a certain extent, the problem of factors considered external in terms of the individual enterprise is implicitly present in the studies of even the early supporters of the organization theory, for a long time only limited attention was paid to such factors, largely caused by the fact that improving the management efficiency of individual enterprises, companies, or organizations yielded immediate results. The organization and management theoreticians ignored almost totally economic and social problems on the macro level, i.e., on the level of the entire society. Their attention was fully and entirely focused on finding the best solution to problems facing individual entrepreneurs or companies. On this basis the contradiction between organization within the enterprise and the lack of a planned production organization on a national scale became more and more aggravated. As F. Engels himself noted, the main tool used by the capitalist production method to increase anarchy in public production has been the very opposite of anarchy: The growing organization of production as public production at each specific production enterprise (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch," Vol 20, p 284).

Directing research to the level of the individual enterprise, company, or monopoly, was, and remains basic to bourgeois management theories. Of late, however, an ever larger number of bourgeois authors are forced to address themselves to problems related to factors considered external in terms of the enterprise, for their decisive importance to the fate of the "free enterprise" system itself is becoming ever more obvious.

Whereas it would be difficult to question a certain level of effectiveness of a number of measures developed by bourgeois science to improve the efficiency of organization and management of individual enterprises, faced with the gravest problems arising on the scale of the entire society and, in the final account, of each individual enterprise, bourgeois science displays its bankruptcy.

More than ever before, today the management of the individual capitalist enterprise faces the tangible problem of how to establish a sensible and reliable connection between it and the "outside world," and how to formulate its orientation, role, and purpose under existing economic, political, and cultural conditions. The use in resolving such problems of the arsenal of

means developed for the solution of organizational-management problems within the enterprise is far from always effective. For example, if we consider the help which the science of management could give the manager of one or another capitalist enterprise in resolving the problem of programming production, the exceptionally limited realm of its application becomes apparent. In order to make one or another management decision which would direct enterprise activities over a certain period of time, a number of specific postulates and hypotheses must exist, which would include the consideration of external factors such as market demand for one or another commodity, its quality and quantity which could be sold on the market and ensure the earning of planned profits, the assessment of possible competition, prediction of economic and social crises, determination of the local or global nature of such crises, determining the economic policy of the state toward a given economic sector, the rate of inflation, and so on. Obviously, in answering such questions or in the presence of more or less substantiated hypotheses, the formulation of a program for action could be carried out through the use of the ways and means which have proved themselves in improving the efficiency within the enterprise. However, the scientific value of the use of logic, mathematical formalizing, systems analysis, and computers may be practically nil, for it totally depends on the accuracy of the initial postulates. Yet, could we speak of a scientific substantiation of hypotheses pertaining to the entire society without touching its very foundations under contemporary capitalist conditions? The need for a scientific approach to the study of outside factors and, on this basis, the shaping of scientifically substantiated forecasts, is entirely obvious. However, it is precisely here that the nearsightedness of the positivistic-empirical approach of the bourgeois theory of management are manifested with particular clarity when studying the laws governing the functioning of the economic mechanism of the capitalist society. Essentially, it reveals the fear of the future displayed by the ruling class.

The study of external factors is presented in contemporary bourgeois theories unsystematically and with a great variety of approaches. Some researchers ignore external factors in general.

Another group of bourgeois authors allows the arbitrary separation of some external factors from other, even though it applies mathematical modelling methods (for example, market forecast models are made through statistical extrapolation). However, they limit themselves merely to the statistical processing of rather doubtful and quite incomplete data.

Yet another group of authors is trying to apply more systematically the methods of multiple factor analysis, involving into consideration a rather large number of variables related to external factors and affecting the fate of the enterprise. However, since multi-factorial analysis is not based on a scientific theory which would provide an overall cause and relation interpretation of socioeconomic development processes, and suffers from eclecticism, it does not provide the necessary scientificity even though such methods could be substantiated from a purely mathematical viewpoint.

In such studies the choice of variables is not subordinated to any kind of scientific criterion based on a reliable theory regarding the economic and social reality surrounding the enterprise but on intuition. Let us also note that, changing the structure of input data, multi-factor analysis makes it clearer, more understandable, without providing, however, a sensible substantiation, not to speak of a development prognosis. Consequently, the multi-factor analysis, as applied by bourgeois researchers, makes it possible to consider the sum total of changes without establishing the causal relations among them, developing the idea that the external environment of the enterprise consists of a multiplicity of unrelated phenomena and circumstances.

These are merely a few examples illustrating the attempts of contemporary bourgeois theoreticians to consider the management problem on the macro level. Here they encounter tremendous difficulties, insurmountable through their methodology, for they are dealing with the task of systematizing a very chaotic phenomenon such as socioeconomic reality under capitalism. Yet, the very logic of development proves the unquestionable fact that without an efficient and scientifically substantiated organization of all social life the scientific management of enterprises, considered the social "nuclei," is impossible. The interdependence of its individual "nuclei," of its links within the single system of society as a whole, becomes ever stronger. Consequently, in order not to fall behind practical requirements, theory must address itself to this all-embracing process. In the current interpretation of management science, the boundaries of its problems are expanded further and further. Today they include not only problems of the scientific organization of public production on the scale of the entire society, within its governmental boundaries, but problems of controlling global development processes whose significance will continue to grow with the further development of the scientific and technical revolution.

Since under contemporary conditions problems of organization and management may not be limited to individual enterprises the critical study of the bourgeois management concepts should not ignore the various theories, economic primarily, dealing with problems of controlling the economy of capitalist countries. The currently developed system of state-monopoly control was the result of a lengthy evolution determined by the growing contradictions within the capitalist production method. As we know, J. Keynes was the most influential representative of bourgeois economic science substantiating the ways and means for easing the crisis phenomena in the capitalist economy. He was the author of the systematic elaboration of the new concept of the economic role of the bourgeois state as a "regulator of public demand" and "stimulator of public production." Keynesianism became widespread not only in contemporary bourgeois economic theory but practice as well, greatly influencing the role of the bourgeois government in economic life and in all bourgeois institutions. Characteristically, this trend developed after the 1929-1933 worldwide economic crisis. For many years, developing and modifying Keynesian concepts, bourgeois science praised them as a radical means for "restoring the health" of capitalism. However, the economic and social upheavals experienced by the capitalist world in the past decade has clearly proved the

crisis of such concepts as well. In recent years the criticism of bourgeois economists who had promised to eliminate economic cycles and open the way to "long prosperity" has been drastically increasing quite legitimately. "Defending themselves," wrote Arthur Okun, former chief economic advisor to U.S. President L. Johnson, "most economists claim that the main prescriptions issued two generations ago by the British economist John Maynard Keynes, are still functioning quite well, since they apply to overall economic management; actually, the advisors of General Ford (J. Carter's predecessor--the author) claimed that all that the system needs is minor effectiveness improvements. However, the inflationary wave of the 1970's exposed the striking weaknesses of the classical theory. Simply stated, it is no longer possible to squeeze the real world into the old theoretical framework. In the absence of new ideas, economists of all categories are only trying to attempt theory to facts" (NEWSWEEK, 17 May 1976, p 49).

In our view, this statement describes quite accurately the condition of scientific developments in the field of economic management in today's capitalist world. It is characteristic that Keynesianism is being fiercely criticized even by its former supporters. Thus, (F. Khayyek), a noted representative of the "neo-classical" school now claims the following: "Most economists--those described as Keynesians--have given their governments wrong advice over the past 25 years. It is precisely they who must be blamed for the confusion in which we find ourselves. They must pour ashes on their heads and, dress in rags, do penance" (quoted from Yu. I. Bobrakov, "Prices in State-Monopoly Economic Control," SShA--EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA, No 12, 1975, p 12).

Bourgeois economic science is seeking solutions to the ever more dramatic problem of capitalist socioeconomic development. As is the case with organization and management theories, disorder reigns in this area and a great variety of frequently usually exclusive viewpoints are expressed. There is a typical effort to intensify planning in controlling the capitalist economy. The bourgeois economists are becoming more interested in the theory and practice of national economic planning in the socialist countries. However, other trends in bourgeois economic science oppose all attempts at introducing the planning methods on a national scale, legitimately fearing for the future of the "free enterprise system." Even though there is no unity among the bourgeois economists in formulating methods for rescuing the capitalist society from new upheavals, the idea that it is necessary to control in one way or another development processes rather than rely on the surprises dealt by an "invisible hand" uncontrolledly directing socioeconomic processes, is becoming dominant ever more clearly.

5003

CSO: 1802

CONSISTENT LENINIST

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 78 pp 103-112

[Article by S. Khromov, doctor of historical sciences]

[Text] The autumn of 1933 . . . late at night, in the apartment of the USSR Gosplan chairman, in the ancient building of the former Poteschniy Palace, in the Kremlin, intensive work is underway on the final draft of the Second Five-Year Plan. The closest assistants to the chairman have gathered here. Interrupting the work for a minute, the apartment's owner, Valerian Vladimirovich Kuybyshev, dreamily says:

"We shall fulfill this five-year plan, and then the next, and our country will become unrecognizable . . . Gigantic electric power plants will rise on the Volga; new seas will be created and water will pour along the Volga-Don Canal. The most difficult thing is to imagine how life will seethe in the deserts cut by the Ob', Irtysh, Angara, and Yenisey. Yet, after two or three five-year plans we will absolutely reach these remote places."

By the will of Lenin's party these dreams have long become reality. They contain a particle of the mind, heart, and work of Kuybyshev--one among those whose name has been entered forever in the history of the great Bolshevik Leninist party.

V. V. Kuybyshev entered the party at the age of 16 and, since then--the summer of 1904--dedicated his entire life to the cause of the working class, to the struggle for the victory of socialism. His clandestine revolutionary activities were full of privations and adversity. He was arrested eight times and spent seven years in jails and exile. However, the arbitrary rule of the Tsarist authorities and the difficulties involved in the work of a professional revolutionary strengthened even further his belief in the inevitability of the victory of the Revolution.

Kuybyshev covered the great path from rank and file party fighter to member of the Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the Council of People's Commissars. All his life he retained his great faith in the revolutionary-transforming role of the working class and the toiling masses--the principal makers of history.

From the rostrum of the 17th VKP(b) Congress, Valerian Vladimirovich said the following, with a feeling of tremendous satisfaction with the results of the construction activities of the Communist Party and the Soviet people who had radically altered the face of the country and the people themselves: "The greatness of our epoch lies in the congress of blacksmiths and stablemen who gather in the Hall of Columns in the House of Unions . . . in the 9,000 workers of the Stalingrad Plant who passed their examination for basic technical knowledge; in the young Oset engineer who was educated by the victorious proletariat and is boldly opening a plant for electrolytic zinc; in the Elektrozavod worker, yesterday's housewife, today making a speech on the future and prospects of the electric power industry. The greatness of our epoch is in the high political maturity of the working class which succeeded to ensure the victory of socialism in a backward country; in the millions of workers and kolkhoz members who follow with the greatest attention what is happening in the USSR and abroad, deeply feeling their great responsibility for the entire cause of building socialism."

Valerian Kuybyshev was born in June 1888 in Omsk; his father was an officer and his mother was an elementary school teacher.

As a sixth grade student member of the cadet corps, Kuybyshev establishes contacts with a clandestine social democratic circle in Omsk. It was during that period that the youngster developed his revolutionary outlook. He thoroughly studied the works of Gertsen, Chernyshevskiy, and Pisarev, and, subsequently, Marx, Engels, and Lenin. He distributed Marxist pamphlets and leaflets and engaged in verbal propaganda and agitation. After the shooting of workers in Petersburg, on 9 January 1905, he made an outstanding speech exposing Tsarism.

In September 1905 Kuybyshev reached Petersburg and immediately plunged in revolutionary work: Distribution of Bolshevik publications and transportation of weapons, carrying out other party assignments, displaying truly revolutionary endurance, courage, daring, and resourcefulness. Forced to hide in order to avoid the inevitable detention, he moved to Omsk. In this connection, Kuybyshev wrote: "I have become so accustomed with Petersburg that it was unbearably difficult to leave the city which had become my great, stern, and favorite school of party work."

Valerian Kuybyshev was made member of the Omsk Party Committee and assigned the overall management of propaganda work. In November 1906 he was arrested together with other delegates to the Omsk All-City Bolshevik Conference. Following his release, in April 1907, Kuybyshev clandestinely reached Tomsk, where he became member of the local RSDWP committee. Hiding, to prevent another detention, toward the end of May he reached Petropavlovsk where he undertook the publication of the clandestine newspaper STEPNA YA ZHIZN'. Police persecution forced him to go to Kainsk (today Kuybyshev, Novosibirskaya Oblast).

In the autumn of 1907 Kuybyshev returned to Petersburg. He worked as a common laborer in a sand quarry, gave private lessons, and continued to wage the revolutionary struggle. However, soon afterwards, he was again detained and sent to the Tomsk jail and, subsequently, exiled to Kainsk. In April 1909 he was detained and imprisoned again. Following his release, Kuybyshev entered Tomsk University. He continued his active revolutionary activities among the youth and the workers. In February 1910 he was arrested again and exiled to Narymskiy Kray.

Valerian Vladimirovich was one of the organizers and lecturers of the Narym Party School for Exiled Revolutionaries. Here, thanks to his efforts, a Bolshevik organization was established.

Kuybyshev engaged in revolutionary work in Petersburg, Vologda, and Khar'kov. In the winter of 1913 he went to see J. I. Petrovskiy, Bolshevik deputy to the state Duma, in his apartment, with the statement that he wanted to work more closely to the party's Central Committee. Petrovskiy subsequently recalled that "V. I. Lenin ascribed great importance to the fact that Comrade Valerin had come to his own to the faction and offered his services, assessing this as a symptomatic phenomenon: The best forces of our party are coming to life and are gathering, he said."

In the autumn of 1914 Kuybyshev became member of the Petersburg RSDWP Committee as the head of the agitation and propaganda collegium. He conducted extensive propaganda work in the capital's enterprises; his work as secretary of the mutual hospital insurance at the Geysler and Treugol'nik plants was the legitimate cover of his clandestine activities. "Kuybyshev . . . is one of the most active members of the local clandestine Leninist leading group . . . ," was the way the security department rated his activities.

In June 1915 he was detained again, for the seventh time. Kuybyshev was sentenced to three year exile in Tutury Village, Verkholskiy Uyezd, Irkutskaya Guberniya, 350 versts away. In Tutury Valerian Vladimirovich engaged in party work among the exiles and headed a theory circle. A. Chvannikov, one of its members, wrote: "I was amazed at how much Kuybyshev knew, how well educated and highly cultured he was." Former exile I. Ionov noted that, ". . . he contaminated us with his Bolshevism, his revolutionary energy."

The revolutionary movement in the country was intensified. Kuybyshev escaped and, in March 1916, having clandestinely arrived in Samara (today Kuybyshev) he became a turner at the Trubochnyy Plant. Together with A. S. Bubnov and other Bolsheviks he prepared the convention of the Povolzh'ye Conference of Bolshevik Organizations. In September 1916, however, he was arrested and sentenced to five years in exile in Turukhanskiy Kray.

Before leaving for his place of exile, Valerian Vladimirovich wrote to his friends that "our victory is near." Indeed, the revolution came soon afterwards. Yet, it was only on 8 March 1917 that, covering 200 versts from Krasnoyarsk in the direction of Turukhansk, that Kuybyshev was set free and, on 17 March, returned to revolutionary Samara. Several days later he was

elected chairman of the Samara Soviet of Workers' Deputies and then member of the bureau of the party's guberniya committee. He was a delegate to the Seventh (April) All-Russian RSDWP(b) Conference where he met Lenin for the first time. Meeting the leader of the revolution made an inerradicable impression on Kuybyshev. Subsequently, in March 1923, he expressed the profound and most meaningful statement that "to us Comrade Lenin is a symbol of the building of our party, its past, and its nature. Comrade Lenin symbolizes the thinking, the creative and unrestrainedly bold thinking which has always been inherent in us, the revolutionary Marxists-Bolsheviks. Comrade Lenin is a symbol of the persistence, stubbornness, and ability to implement plans and reach targets even under the most difficult of circumstances. This has always been our party's main feature."

Returning from Petrograd and relying on the decisions of the April Conference, Kuybyshev waged an adamant struggle for acquiring a majority within the Samara Soviet and engaged in propaganda among the garrison troops. On the eve of the uprising he was elected chairman of the party's guberniya committee. He organized the armed uprising of the Samara workers and soldiers. On 27 October, at dawn, a revolutionary committee was set up headed by Kuybyshev as the organ of proletarian dictatorship in the city and guberniya. Samara was one of the Russian cities in which the Soviet system was established immediately. Soon afterwards Valerian Vladimirovich became chairman of the guberniya executive committee of the soviet of workers', soldiers', and peasants' deputies. He could be legitimately considered one of the main leaders and organizers of the victory of the Socialist Revolution in this important part of the country.

An essentially new stage in the party's history and in the lives and activities of its active builders, one of whom was Valerian Vladimirovich Kuybyshev, began.

Remaining in his position as chairman of the guberniya executive committee, in March 1918 he headed the Samara Sovnarkhoz and took measures to organize the economy and convert it to a socialist base. He was a delegate to the Seventh RKP(b) Congress and the Fourth All-Russian Congress of Soviets.

In the city the counter-revolution energized its forces. Detachments of the Kosak Ataman Dutov tried to surround Orenburg, and cut it off of Samara. In this connection, as chairman of the soviet, at the beginning of April 1918 Kuybyshev directly appealed to Vladimir Il'ich Lenin: "Comrade Lenin, the Dutov partisans have raised their heads again in Orenburg . . . Samara is doing everything possible to help Orenburg. However, local forces are insufficient to ensure the final defeat of the Dutov movement. Help from the center is necessary." Lenin answered: "I shall immediately take all the necessary measures to inform on the spot the military department and give you help" ("Poln Sobr Soch" [Complete Collected Works], Vol 50, p 55). Help was provided without delay. However, the situation was complicated by the mutiny of the Czechoslovak corps which, together with the White Guards, captured Penza and, subsequently Samara. Kuybyshev reached Simbirsk

with the last boat and established there the Samarskaya Guberniya Revolutionary Committee. An eastern front consisting of five armies was organized. Kuybyshev was appointed commissar of the first army while retaining the position of chairman of the guberniya revolutionary committee, while M. N. Tukhazhevskiy was appointed commanding officer. In the difficult circumstances of the civil war and foreign intervention, Kuybyshev became one of the political leaders of the Red Army. Organizing political work, he frequently personally led Red Army attacks, displaying great knowledge of the foundations of military affairs.

The White Czechs captured Simbirsk on 22 July and Kazan' on 6 August. The young Soviet Republic was in danger. "Today the entire fate of the revolution," Lenin wrote then, "will be decided by a single thing: Fast victory over the Czechoslovaks along the Kazan'-Ural-Samara front. Everything depends on this" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 50, p 133). All possible forces were mobilized to oppose the enemy. Simbirsk--Vladimir Il'ich's native city--was liberated on 12 September. On this occasion, those present at a Red Army meeting, chaired by Kuybyshev, passed the resolution of sending a cable the Lenin. In his answering telegram Vladimir Il'ich congratulated the Red Army men for their victory and, on behalf of all working people, expressed his gratitude (see "Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 37, p 95).

Following the liberation of Samara, the RKP(b) Central Committee assigned Kuybyshev to party-soviet work. He was elected chairman of the Samara City Soviet and, subsequently, in February 1919, chairman of the guberniya executive committee. This was another recognition of the great prestige which Kuybyshev had earned among the Samara working people. "I have become close to the Samara proletariat," he wrote. "I cherish its trust . . ." (V. V. Kuybyshev, "Izbr. Proizv." [Selected Works], Moscow, 1958, p 92). Valerian Vladimirovich was a delegate to the Eighth Party Congress which adopted the second party program.

As a result of the offensive mounted by Kolchak, in April 1919 Kuybyshev was appointed member of the revolutionary council of the Southern Group of Forces of the Eastern Front, commanded by M. V. Frunze. It was then that the friendship between these two outstanding Bolsheviks began.

At the end of April the Southern Group Forces mounted their counter-attack on a front some 300 kilometers long; on 9 June the 25th Chapayev Division liberated Ufa; Ural'sk was liberated on 11 July. On 14 July the Kolchak forces were expelled from Yekaterinburg (now Sverdlovsk). In connection with these Red Army victories, Kuybyshev wrote: "The armed people, workers, and peasants, accomplished an exploit, a miracle."

Meanwhile, the front circumstances in the Tsaritsyn area became troublesome. Having captured Tsaritsyn, the Denikin forces cut off the Volga line from Astrakhan' to Saratov and Samara. Lenin proclaimed the slogan "Everything in the Struggle against Denikin!" At the end of July Kuybyshev was appointed member of the revolutionary military council of the Astrakhan' group of

forces while remaining member of the revolutionary military council of the Southern Group of Forces of the Eastern Front. On 30 July Valerin Vladimirovich reached Astrakhan' whose defense was commanded by S. M. Kirov. Temporarily Kuybyshev was made commander of the 11th Army and Kirov was appointed member of its revolutionary military council. In the course of an aerial combat, displaying personal courage and bravery, Kuybyshev was in an airplane, machine gun in hand, repulsing a raid on the city by British aviation. In the course of the battle an enemy airplane was brought down and captured.

In October 1919 Kuybyshev became member of the revolutionary military council of the Turkistan front and a member of the Commission of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the RSFSR Sovnarkom in charge of Turkistan affairs (Turkkomissiya), in charge of the military organs and party work. While in Central Asia, he actively participated in the implementation of Lenin's national policy. "It would be no exaggeration to say that the importance to the RSFSR of establishing proper relations with the peoples of Turkistan," Lenin wrote, "is of tremendous, of universal-historical significance. The attitude of the Soviet workers' and peasants' republic toward weak and so far oppressed peoples will be of practical importance to all of Asia and all colonies throughout the world, to thousands and millions of people" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 39, p 304). In his speech at the Third Kray Conference of Moslem Communists, Kuybyshev said: "Through joint efforts . . . here, in Turkistan, we shall establish a model of how one must work in former colonies." He suggested that "the broad strata of the Moslem masses become involved in soviet work," and called for recruiting the working people of the native populations within the Red Army. The Turkistan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic was established; the party organizations merged within the Communist Party of Turkistan, a component of the RKP(b). In May 1920 Kuybyshev was made chairman of the Turkkomissiya.

Clearing Turkistan territory from White Guard hordes was one of the main tasks of the republic's party and soviet organs. As early as November 1919 Kuybyshev went to the front; he took part in the long march of the troops across a waterless desert, in freezing weather, walking most of the time or riding in commanding military operations. Important enemy strongholds were captured--the Kazandzhik, Aydin, Akhcha-Kuyma, and Pereval'naya stations.

Kuybyshev was one of the organizers of the struggle against the Basmaks in Fergana, in the winter and spring of 1920, the suppression of the anti-Soviet mutiny in Vernyy (now Alma-Ata), and the aid provided the people's revolution in Bukhara (August-September 1920). The victory of this revolution marked the elimination of the final bulwark of British intervention and bourgeois-nationalist reaction in Central Asia. Kuybyshev became the first representative of the RSFSR to the Bukhara People's Soviet Republic.

After defeating the main forces of the White Guards and foreign interventionists, the working people of the Soviet state were able to focus their main efforts on peaceful socialist construction. The party directed its

best forces to the economic front. Kuybyshev, who had come from Central Asia to attend the Eighth Congress of Soviets, went to work in the trade unions. He headed the economic department and was a member of the AUCCTU Presidium. Soon afterwards he was elected member of the All-Union Sovnarkhoz Presidium. At the 10th RKP(b) Congress Kuybyshev was elected Central Committee candidate member; he was made Central Committee member at the 11th Congress. In October 1921 Valerian Vladimirovich became chief of the Main Administration of Electrical Engineering Industry of the All-Union Sovnarkhoz.

In April 1922 Kuybyshev was elected RKP(b) Central Committee secretary and member of the Central Committee organizational bureau. He was put in charge of propaganda and publishing. His organizational talent was revealed further in that position. As early as 1919, at the peak of the civil war, Valerian Vladimirovich wrote: "I am platonically interested in work in the field of proletarian culture where, it seems to me, I could create a great deal. Among the projects I have been engaged in I have been interested most of all in party work in all its scope." The nature of Kuybyshev's activities in the party's Central Committee precisely coincided with his profound wishes.

At the 12th Party Congress (April 1923) in accordance with Lenin's suggestions, the Central Control Commission (TsKK) of the RKP(b) and the Workers' and Peasants' Inspectorate (RKI) merged within a single organ in charge of safeguarding party unity, strengthening party and state discipline, and ensuring the comprehensive improvement of the Soviet state apparatus. V. V. Kuybyshev was assigned the high position of chairman of the TsKK and RKI people's commissar. He was also made deputy chairman of the Council of People's Commissars and of the USSR Labor and Defense Council. After F. E. Dzerzhinskiy's death, in July 1926, Valerian Vladimirovich was made chairman of the USSR All-Union Sovnarkhoz and, in November 1930, Gosplan chairman and deputy chairman of the USSR Sovnarkom and labor and defense council. At the beginning of 1934 he was made chairman of the Soviet Control Commission and, subsequently, first deputy chairman of the Sovnarkom and the labor and defense council. From December 1927 to the end of his life Kuybyshev was member of the Politburo of VKP(b) Central Committee.

In his responsible positions in the party and the state, Kuybyshev systematically promoted the Leninist ideas of the country's socialist industrialization, agricultural collectivization, and cultural revolution. Tirelessly propagandizing these ideas, he contributed to the theoretical elaboration of the problem of the creation of factual socialism. "Socialism," he said in 1924, "is a system with high technology, highly developed economy, and high productive forces. Such is the ideal to which all of us aspire" (Institute of Marxism-Leninism Central Party Archives, Archive 79, List 1, File 292, Sheet 3). Addressing Leningrad engineers and technicians, in January 1930, Kuybyshev stated that, "socialism represents the highest level of technical development." In accordance with Lenin's theory, he considered higher labor productivity "the task of tasks in the building of socialism" (Institute of Marxism-Leninism Central Party Archives, Archive 79, List 1,

File 292, Sheet 15). Emphasizing that the working class and all working people are the ones who are most interested, above all, in the growth of labor productivity, Kuybyshev said: " . . . The worker must clearly realize . . . that his personal prosperity, living standard, and wage level is correlated and consistent with the further development of labor productivity."

He paid a great deal of attention to improving production management and the scientific organization of labor. Substantiating the need for rapid economic development, in his speech at the October 1925 Plenum of the RKP(b), Valerian Vladimirovich formulated, in this connection, the task of making the economic management methods consistent with these development rates.

Kuybyshev actively supported the party line aimed at involving to an ever greater extent the broad toiling masses in management. He insisted that "one-man command must be combined with the even broader involvement of the widest possible working masses in production management in the sense of self-criticism, participation in production conferences, participation in the elaboration . . . of plans by a given enterprise, and so on" (Institute of Marxism-Leninism Central Party Archives, Archive 79, List 1, File 358, Sheet 47).

In a Leninist manner Kuybyshev considered the establishment of close ties between leaders and the masses an important aspect in management organization. "More live rather than dry formalistic management!" was the way he formulated his thought in one of his speeches. In his view, the type of relations between the apparatus personnel and the rank and file working people must play an important role. "We must," he wrote, "totally abandon the dry and bureaucratic style, iced by foreign words, replacing it with a simple and clear explanation of the matter, understood by the broad worker-peasant masses."

In Kuybyshev's opinion the study and utilization of progressive experience was one of the ways to improve the work of the administrative apparatus. In a speech in Leningrad (1927) he said: "Emulation of good example and a decisive struggle against slackness, inability to work, boastfulness, and inability to learn must be promoted most decisively everywhere in the economic and state apparatus."

Kuybyshev singled out the following among the important features of the Soviet manager: System in the work, constant feeling for the entire complexity of phenomena and their interconnection, and accurate feeling for the consequences of one or another measure. The requirement he formulated in the spirit of Lenin's instructions remains topical: "Less political chattering, sensationalism and conversations "in general"; more action, more practical discussion of problems related to the life of the enterprise and the implementation of its assignments" (V. V. Kuybyshev, "Izbr. Proizv.," p 126).

Kuybyshev himself was a model of concrete and efficient management of his assigned sectors in party and state construction. He always turned to the masses, addressing them, visiting new construction projects, studying progressive experience on the spot, and urging on the laggards.

Kuybyshev considered as the most important factor in the successful building of socialism high work quality as a whole, including the quality of output. "The problems of work quality," he emphasized, "are assuming . . . decisive significance. This offers tremendous possibilities for accelerating the pace of our development" (ibid, p 118).

From the rostrum of the 17th VKP(b) Congress, Kuybyshev raised the question of the quality of output to the level of a task of tremendous governmental importance. "It must be understood that today fighting for good fabrics, good shoes, a good suit of clothes, and good oil," he said, "is no less honorable than participating in building of heavy industry in Dneprostroy. It is equally clear that, having succeeded in the building of Dneprostroy, the Bolsheviks could and should cope with production quality problems" (ibid, p 476).

Valerian Vladimirovich directly linked the struggle for quality with improvements in the wage system: "We must organize the wage system in such a way as to stimulate the production of good quality goods, making it absolutely unprofitable to the worker to produce faulty and poorly made goods."

Kuybyshev made a major contribution to the theory and practice of socialist planning. It would be difficult to overestimate his role in the formulation of the First and Second Five-Year Plans for the USSR national economy. In the course of this work he called for drafting an "economically profoundly thought out" five-year plan.

Kuybyshev made a major contribution to the theoretical interpretation of the matter of the rational distribution of the country's productive forces. He paid particular attention to the need to accelerate the pace of the economic development of Siberian and Far Eastern areas. "With its huge space and tremendous natural resources," he said at the 16th Party Congress, "Siberia is an area to which the future promises a tempestuous rate of development." Valerian Vladimirovich emphasized the important national economic significance of the building of the Baykal-Amur Main Line.

Kuybyshev directly related the planned nature of the Soviet economy to the proper understanding and implementation of the principle of democratic centralism and its management. "We can not," he said, "go so far in decentralization as to disturb our planned management and planned economy, and allow chaos in the work of our industry." Kuybyshev asserted that "with the full victory of socialism" the country's economy will become a "integrated national economic complex" (V. V. Kuybyshev, op cit, p 378).

According to Valerian Vladimirovich the adopted national economic plan must be the law of all enterprises and labor collectives. "The fulfillment and, if possible, overfulfillment of one's enterprise plan," he noted, "must be a matter of revolutionary honor of every worker, party member, or social organization in the enterprise" (ibid, p 125).

The planned socialist economy makes it possible to ensure the most effective utilization of scientific and technical achievements. " . . . A planned socialist economy alone," Kuybyshev wrote, "offers broad scope for scientific thought and for real creativity . . ." He called for "fighting against routine, sluggishness, conservatism, conceit, and communist arrogance," and "work in a new way, using new methods consistent with the tasks of the technical revolution."

Kuybyshev considered criticism and self-criticism an important lever in all this work. In a report on the work of the VKP(b) Central Committee, delivered in Nizhniy Novgorod (today Gor'kiy), he said: "As Bolsheviks, we have never tended to engage in self-deception and conceal the real situation. We are the growing and strengthening class and our only interest is to expose to the end, to scourge all our shortcomings, in order to learn from them how to develop an even greater pace and move ahead even faster."

Kuybyshev actively disseminated Lenin's ideas on labor competition: "Socialist competition is becoming the permanent method of our work" (V. V. Kuybyshev, op cit, p 152). Valerian Vladimirovich adamantly called for the adoption of measures to broaden its participants and see to it that "every competitor be precisely familiar with what he is competing for, against whom he is competing, and what are the results and achievements of the one against whom he is competing. The more clarity, simplicity, and specificity is introduced in this great project . . . the greater should and will be the results of socialist competition" (ibid, p 126).

Holding a variety of party and state positions, Kuybyshev was always concerned with the development of the economy and culture of the union republics, with strengthening the friendship among the peoples, the implementation of the party's national policy, and the promotion of socialist democracy. The founding of the USSR, he said, "is the greatest victory of the Leninist national policy," while the USSR Constitution which was adopted in its wake was, in his view, "the manifestation of true Soviet democracy, the type of democracy unknown elsewhere in the world."

The working class, raised by the party, is the principal material bearer of socialist democracy. Kuybyshev considered this one of the most important sociopolitical gains of the Great October Revolution. "Everything awakened by the October Revolution," he wrote, "is now blossoming richly and tempestuously. We have succeeded in rousing millions of people, we have succeeded in making the mass of the working class clearly realize that it is the full master of the country, the makers of its destinies" (V. V. Kuybyshev, op cit, p 150).

At the same time, Valerian Vladimirovich tirelessly explained that the reaching of the party's program targets would require a great deal of time and the tremendous efforts of all working people. "Communism does not appear immediately. It is created as a result of the intensive efforts of millions of people liberated from capitalist exploitation" (ibid, p 377).

Kuybyshev was a passionate and uncompromising fighter for the party's Leninist unity. He headed the TsKK-RKI organs at a time when Trotskyites and other members of the opposition had intensified their attacks against the party line on all basic problems of socialist construction. He deserves tremendous credit for the exposure of their anti-party actions and for his defense of Leninism.

Discussing the role of the TsKK in the struggle against Trotskyism, Valerian Vladimirovich said the following at the 13th RKP(b) Congress: "Together with the Central Committee and using all means at our disposal we fought for the triumph of the Bolshevik Leninist line in the party, defending it from the attacks of the opposition and the petit bourgeoisie currents which had raised their heads at that time."

Kuybyshev tirelessly emphasized the significance of international proletarian solidarity in the common struggle waged by the working people for radical socio-political change, justifiably believing that the "loyalty of our party and working class in our country to the principles of internationalism" is one of the conditions required for the victory of socialism in the USSR (V. V. Kuybyshev, op cit, p 420).

Stemming from the inflexible principles of the peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet state, Kuybyshev actively promoted the broadening of comprehensive economic relations between the USSR and foreign countries, noting in this connection, "the desire of the most sensible segment of the capitalists to strengthen economic relations with us . . ." He considered the development of international economic relations an important condition for peaceful co-existence among countries with different social systems. Valerian Vladimirovich emphasized that through its foreign policy the Soviet Union has proved that it alone in the world heads the real struggle for peace and for the prevention of new wars.

Kuybyshev embodied the most characteristic features of a Leninist type leader: Competence, modesty, tremendous industriousness, clear thinking, absolute efficiency in his actions, a self-critical assessment of the results of his work, high exactingness toward himself and his subordinates, communist purposefulness, and a true party-minded approach to everything.

V. Ya. Chubar' recalls one of the aspects of Kuybyshev's governmental activities: "Valerian Vladimirovich," he wrote, "displayed in his intensive work exceptional vigilance, reaching down to the smallest details, establishing on each matter the positions held by all interested institutions, individuals, and organizations, carefully weighing everything and making decisions based on total knowledge." "He was a Bolshevik from head to toe," was the extremely concise characterization of Kuybyshev given by A. S. Bubnov, who knew him well from the time of clandestine work, in the days of the proletarian revolution, and in the initial years of the building of socialism.

Valerian Vladimirovich died on 25 January 1935 not even 50 years old. He literally burned up in his intensive work for the good of the homeland. The VKP(b) Central Committee stated the following in its announcement of his death: "Comrade Kuybyshev was the model of a proletarian revolutionary and consistent Leninist, irreconcilable toward the enemies of the party and the working class, and a selfless fighter for the communist cause." That is the way the party and the people knew him. That is the way he has remained in the memory and awareness of the new generations of Soviet people, as a vivid example of selfless service to the Marxist-Leninist cause.

5003

CSO: 1802

AMERICAN INTERNATIONALIST AND SINGER OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 78 pp 113-120

[Article by T. Azhgibkov, candidate of philosophical sciences]

[Text] The name John Reed, the American writer and journalist, and singer of the Great October Revolution, the revolutionary and internationalist, is quite familiar in our country. The works and scientific studies by Soviet authors have described the stages in the life and activities of this outstanding person. New factual data on his participation in the revolutionary struggle are being put into scientific circulation ever more extensively.

A number of objective and reliable books and recollections on this topic have been published abroad as well. However, over a long period of time the bourgeois press kept silent on the subject of Reed while works published in recent years provide a tendentious and, frequently, simply falsified biography. Thus, the American sociologists R. O'Connor and D. L. Walker, in their book "The Lost Revolutionary" (Richard O'Connor and Dale L. Walker, "The Lost Revolutionary. A Biography of John Reed," New York, 1967), and B. Gelb, in her book "So Short a Time. A Biography of John Reed and Louise Bryant" (Barbara Gelb, "So Short a Time. A Biography of John Reed and Louise Bryant," New York, 1973) tried to present John Reed either as a "strayed revolutionary," or a "revolutionary romantic," or else a wandering poet or artist, allegedly disillusioned about scientific communism, the experience of the Great October Socialist Revolution, and the building of socialism in Soviet Russia.

The legend of John Reed's "spiritual crash" is groundless. It is backed by nothing other than the fear of the defenders of capitalism of the truth which Reed disseminated, having broken with the bourgeois system and way of life, and taken the side of the working class.

Under imperialist conditions the working class becomes the center of gravity of all progressive forces fighting for peace, democracy, and socialism. In this connection V. I. Lenin wrote: "The best representatives of our educated classes proved and sealed in the blood of thousands of revolutionaries tortured by the government their ability and readiness to shake off of their feet the dust of the bourgeois society and join the socialist ranks" ("Poln Sobr Soch" [Complete Collected Works], Vol 4, p 395).

Fabrications concerning Reed's "spiritual crash" are needed by the bourgeois ideologues in order to distort the true picture of the shaping of his communist outlook under the influence of the Great October Revolution and, personally, Lenin, and conceal from the world public his spiritual beauty, Marxist-Leninist convictions, and proletarian internationalism. It was precisely the post-October period in Reed's life and work, maliciously criticized by the bourgeois press, that was saturated to the brim with revolutionary actions.

History has linked forever the name of the American John Reed with the October Revolution and its leader--Lenin. He was one of the few foreign journalists who was an eye witness of the storming of the Winter Palace and the proclamation of the Soviet system. He was a heroic fighter in the Leninist guard on this planet.

John Reed was well familiar with the initial decrees issued by the Soviet government. He thoroughly collected facts on the initial steps of the new civilization and the revolutionary creativity of the working people in the Soviet state. On the basis of what he had seen and heard, and the extensive data he had studied thoroughly, he drew the conclusion that these people are building "on earth the type of bright kingdom which could be found in no heaven, the type of kingdom for which one would be happy to die . . ." (J. Reed, "Desyat' Dney, Kotoryye Potrayasli Mir" [Ten Days that Shook the World], Gospolitizdat, Moscow, 1957, p 212).

John Reed dreamed of meeting Lenin. He was lucky to see the leader of the world's proletariat at the historical session of the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets, held on 26 October 1917, and to hear his words which proclaimed to mankind the advent of a new epoch.

It was as of then that Reed became Lenin's loyal student. He was the first foreign writer to work on the artistic representation of Vladimir Il'ich's personality, laying the beginning of foreign literary Leniniana. The character of the immortal genius of the Revolution created by this writer was the highest result of his thoughts and skill.

Reed intended to write a book on Lenin and he studied with exceptional care the life and activities of the great leader. "Should I find myself locked up in prison," he said, "and should I have nothing other than a nail, I would still scratch with this nail my book on Russia and Lenin on the walls of my prison cell." Reed had the luck to talk with Vladimir Il'ich repeatedly in his office, at home, and at international gatherings of the communist and workers' movements. The American journalist recorded for the future generations the simple and great image of Lenin, and his powerful moral strength. Lenin, he emphasized, is an unusually popular leader, exclusively thanks to his intellect, and daring mind "possessing the powerful ability to bring to light the most complex ideas in the simplest words and provide a profound analysis of the specific circumstances . . ." (J. Reed, "Ten Days . . .," p 116).

John Reed saw in the October Revolution which won in a ruined country the birth of a new, socialist world and reached the conviction that the theory and practice of the Leninist party reflect the expectations and basic interests of the people's masses. Acknowledging the need for a revolution and working class power, aimed at ensuring the transition from capitalism to socialism, he most actively participated in the struggle for the implementation of communist ideals and in the dissemination of the immortal Leninist ideas.

. . . 10 January 1918. Petrograd. The weather was cold. Yet, apparently the delegates to the Third Congress of Soviets seemed to ignore the cold. They had come from all ends of revolutionary Russia: Seamen and workers, trenchline soldiers, and bearded peasants. They looked excited. They had visited Smol'nyy.

The floor was given to Vladimir Il'ich. The breath of the revolution spread across the hall. There were shouts of "hurray!", and "Long live Comrade Lenin!", coming from all sides. Something powerful was felt in this enthusiasm. Both congress delegates and guests, including John Reed, and his friend Albert Reece Williams, another progressive journalist from the United States tried to catch every single of the leader's words.

V. I. Lenin pointed out that the Soviet system had been in existence for two months and 15 days, i.e., five days longer than the Paris Commune. The leader of the revolution then described to the delegates the way the country had lived through these two and a half months, the ratio of class forces, the accomplishments of the new state system, and the social tasks it faced. Lenin ended his speech as follows: "Our socialist Soviet republic will remain firm, like a torch of international socialism, and as an example to all toiling masses" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 35, p 279).

Lenin's simplicity, clarity, and convincing power made a tremendous impression on the delegates. Reed was amazed at the leader's absolute sincerity and dedication. On his own initiative, he spoke among other foreign guests, presenting greetings on behalf of the American comrades.

John Reed was presented in the hall as the editor of the revolutionary journal THE MASSES, banned by the authorities, and as a progressive journalist, running the risk of a 40 year jail term in the United States. His appearance on the rostrum was welcomed with ovations.

What did the American journalist say in his first public speech in Soviet Russia, from the high rostrum of the Third Congress of Soviets? He expressed his deep satisfaction that the victory of the proletariat in one of the biggest countries was not a dream but reality and, returning to the "conservative country of the ruling imperialists, he promised to describe to the American proletariat everything accomplished in revolutionary Russia, deeply confident that this would meet with a response among the oppressed and exploited masses" (Central State Archives of the October Revolution, Archive 1,235, List 2, File 2, Sheet 17).

John Reed kept his word. Returning to America in April 1918, he became an active fighter for the implementation of Lenin's ideas.

From the very first day of the October Revolution imperialism mounted a frenzied anti-Soviet campaign to protect the capitalist countries from the influence of the ideas of the first socialist country. The United States followed toward Soviet Russia a policy of war and blockade while the American bourgeois press systematically slandered the Bolsheviks.

Returning to the United States, Reed openly confronted the capitalist press, police, and courts in the defense of the Russian Socialist Revolution. He promoted Leninism and the example of the October Revolution. In 1918-1919 he published in the leftwing press a series of articles on Soviet Russia: "The Russian Revolution in Action," a letter to Upton Sinclair, "The New Appeal," "The Origin of Bolshevism," "Bolshevism as It Is Not in Fact," "Aspects of the Russian Revolution," and many others. They offer a truthful and objective assessment of the October Revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, and an angry rebuff to the slanderers, including the opportunists of the Second International.

The articles considered aspects of the nature of the Soviet system and the attitude of the proletariat toward the bourgeois state. Explaining Lenin's theoretical concepts, John Reed pointed out the need for the seizure of the power by the American workers and the breakdown of the former political machine and the creation of a new one which would serve the working people. "Luckily," he pointed out, "such a machine exists--the soviets. All power to the soviets!" ("Aspects of the Russian Revolution," "The Revolutionary Age," July 1919, p 8).

Opposing Kautskiy and other opportunists, he particularly emphasized the role and significance of the revolutionary party of the working class in the preparations for and making of the socialist revolution: ". . . The power of the capitalist armies is based on its centralized organization and on the fact that it is headed by a general staff. Consequently, in order to overthrow capitalism, the army of the working class must also have its centralized organization with its own general staff" (ibid, p 91).

Reed deserves credit also for understanding the nature of proletarian democracy, seeing in it a new, a higher type of democracy, a democracy in the interest of the overwhelming majority of the people. The soviets, he wrote, are a wonderful manifestation of the organizational genius of the toiling masses and represent the most perfect organ of people's representation. "Never before has there been a political organ more responsive to the will of the people . . ." ("The Structure of the Soviet State," "The Liberator," November 1918, p 9).

John Reed saw the new also in the fact that the working people are directly participating in the political life of the country and in the building of socialism. Proletarian democracy, he noted, ensures the involvement of every

working person in the administration of society. "Workers in workers' clothing, openly resolving problems of governmental importance, sat in government commissariats" ("How the Russian Revolution Works," "The Liberator," August 1918, p 16).

In his articles the American journalist exposed the enemies of Leninism who spread rumors that workers are barbarians who could only destroy. He said that the Russian working class is a creative class, a builder, the most humane class. It was only when the Russian landowners and capitalists unleashed a civil war and called upon the interventionists for their help, it was only then that the workers and peasants left their plants and fields and took up weapons. John Reed pointed out that "the Russian government is not only revolutionary but creative, able-bodied, and is supported by the broad strata of the working class of all countries" ("On Intervention in Russia," "The Liberator," November 1918, p 14). In another article he expressed his confidence in the strength of the working class in Russia where "the toiling masses can not only engage in great dreams but have the strength to turn such dreams into reality" ("A Message to Our Readers from John Reed Who Has Just Returned from Petrograd," "The Liberator," June 1918, p 26).

John Reed noted the tempestuous awakening of the political awareness of the Russian popular masses. He wrote inspiredly of the "hundreds of thousands of Russian people" who followed the Bolsheviks "with unparalleled unanimity" ("Lenin and Reed." Documents of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CPSU Central Committee, INOSTRANNAYA LITERATURA, No 11, 1957, p 5). Reed described the active and comprehensive work of the soviets of workers', peasants', and soldiers' deputies which, seizing the power, are successfully implementing socioeconomic changes in the country, directing production activities, and supporting the revolutionary order.

Under conditions in which the intervention forces of 14 imperialist countries, together with the White Guard counter-revolutionary hordes were drowning the Soviet state in blood, while bourgeois propaganda continued to slander it, John Reed proclaimed the truth of the October Revolution, Lenin, the Bolshevik Party, and the first steps of socialism. He was arrested by the bourgeois government of the United States and prosecuted for "subversive activities."

In the 14 September 1918 issue of THE NEW YORK CALL, a socialist newspaper, Reed answered this arbitrary action by the authorities as follows: "If people are sent to jail for opposing the intervention in Russia or the defense of the workers' republic in Russia, I will be proud and happy to go to jail" (see VOPROSY ISTORII, No 11, 1965, p 100).

Reed's revolutionary and propaganda activities were comprehensive. According to (G. Hix) (Reed's biographer) he delivered a number of speeches immediately on arrival in America, i.e., in May 1918. His first speech was delivered in New York, at a mass meeting. He subsequently spoke in Washington, Boston, Brookline, Detroit, Philadelphia, Chicago, and other cities. At meetings and workers' gatherings Reed excitedly described the Soviet system and the heroism of the Soviet people.

Even R. O'Connor and D. L. Walker, in the book we mentioned, are forced to acknowledge that it was precisely Reed who was one of the few Americans of literary and journalistic fame in the United States who could effectively defend Soviet Russia. They point out that "he was ready to speak 20 hours a day so that America could understand Bolshevism . . . Everywhere, adamantly, persistently, and profoundly Reed defended the new Russian government, . . . and communism and the need for proletarian dictatorship in all countries" (R. O'Connor and D. L. Walker, op cit, p 230).

In the autumn of 1918 John Reed began to write his book "Ten Days that Shook the World." In it the author described the spirit of the Great October Revolution, the meaning of the heroic struggle of the Russian proletariat, and the greatness and international importance of Leninism. The book provided a political education to the toiling masses and energized the international all-democratic movement under the slogan of "hands off of Soviet Russia!" We know that Lenin rated it highly. Vladimir Il'lich wrote the preface to the book. This is explained by the fact that Lenin saw in it a weapon in the ideological struggle which began from the very first day of the victory of the October Revolution and is continuing to the present. In the preface Lenin pointed out the main problem of the world's labor movement, a problem which was in the center of the ideological struggle. "John Reed's book," he emphasized, "could unquestionably clarify this matter . . . it provides a truthful and unusually lively description of events so important to understand such as what is a proletarian revolution and what is the dictatorship of the proletariat" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 40, p 48).

Reed's work is not only a "clot of history," as the author himself considered but, essentially, the literary reflection of the theory and practice of Leninism. It describes the implementation of the Leninist plan for a socialist revolution and the Leninist doctrine in action and within specific chronological limits and with specific historical data. "John Reed was the first in world literature to present an epic picture of the birth of the dictatorship of the proletariat" ("Lenin and Reed." Documents of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism. INOSTRANNAYA LITERATURA, No 11, 1957, p 5). That is why Lenin recommended that the book be translated into all world languages and published in millions of copies. He thus emphasized the international exploit of the writer. This exploit was the full manifestation of Reed's aspect as a fiery revolutionary and loyal Leninist.

At the end of 1918 Lenin's "Letter to the American Workers" reached the United States. The question of its publication arose. However, under conditions marked by an unrestrained anti-Soviet campaign this was no easy matter. John Reed was the only American who attended a conference of Russian revolutionaries in New York to discuss the possibility for the dissemination of this outstanding Leninist document. He reported at the conference the complex talks he had conducted with the big bourgeois press and other media for the wide dissemination of Lenin's letter.

Even though no success was achieved in publishing the letter in the big bourgeois newspapers, nevertheless, within a short time the letter was published by a number of progressive publications. It was first published in December 1918 by the journal THE CLASS STRUGGLE and the weekly THE REVOLUTIONARY AGE, followed by the newspapers NEW YORK CALL, THE NEW WORLD, and THE INDUSTRIAL WORKER. Its circulation throughout the country reached five million copies.

Lenin's letter energized the progressive social circles in the United States, helped to intensify objections to the intervention in Russia, and rallied and strengthened the ranks of the communist movement in America.

John Reed's articles in American newspapers and periodicals, his fiery speeches at meetings, his decisive role in the dissemination of Lenin's works and the text of the note addressed by the Soviet government to U.S. President W. Wilson, and his active contribution to the leftwing socialist journals THE COMMUNIST and THE REVOLUTIONARY AGE, activities conducted in 1918, were of major importance in defending the country of the October Revolution, the development of the American labor movement itself, and the ideological preparation of the social awareness of the working class and toiling masses for the establishment of a U.S. Communist Party. Unquestionably, John Reed is one of the noted ideological inspirers of its creation.

We shall not discuss here the history of the appearance of a communist party in the United States. Let us merely point out that Reed sought Lenin's advice on problems of the American communist and workers' movements, and that this question was discussed in the course of their talks. Reed had reason to say that he left Lenin with a feeling of "having been given the key opening the gates to the future" (Karl Khovi, "L'venok. Dzhon Rid, Kakim Ya Yego Znal" [The Young Lion. John Reed as I Knew Him], Moscow, 1967, p 308). This key was Lenin's ideas which Reed was able to apply under U.S. conditions.

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the successful struggle waged by the Soviet state against the forces of the Entente and the domestic counter-revolution had a tremendous impact on the political activity of the international proletariat and inaugurated a new stage in the development of the workers' and national-liberation movements.

The American labor movement as well felt the powerful influence of the October Revolution ideas. This is confirmed, among others, by the fast dissemination of Lenin's works in the United States. Lenin's theoretical works, articles, interviews, appeals and addresses, and letters, as well as the documents issued by the Soviet government were published in the United States between 1917 and 1919.

The works of the great leader of the international proletariat played a tremendous role in the ideological education of the leftwing socialists and contributed to the consolidation of revolutionary groups and currents.

Despite being tremendously busy with governmental and party affairs, Lenin made use of all possibilities to meet and talk with American revolutionaries, helping them to understand better the ideas of the October Revolution and to become conscientious fighters for communism.

V. I. Lenin had a tremendous influence on John Reed's further career as the latter returned clandestinely to the Soviet Union in the autumn of 1919. Vladimir highly valued him for his revolutionary zeal and dedication and involved him in active work in the Third International. On Lenin's request, before the Second Comintern Congress, Reed drafted a note on "The Communist Movement in America." In it the author described the main stages marking the history of the American socialist movement preceding the creation of a communist party, described the influence of the Great October Revolution on the American socialists, criticized opportunism which had betrayed the basic interests of the working class, and formulated views on the elaboration of the theoretical foundations and organizational principles of the U.S. Communist Party (see "Lenin and Reed." Documents of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, INOSTRANNAYA LITERATURA, No 11, 1957, p 3).

John Reed displayed the strength of his ideological convictions and loyalty to Lenin's ideas at the congress itself which opened on 19 July 1920. As delegate to the congress he addresses the session on three occasions in the debates on the national and colonial problem and the trade union movement.

The national and colonial problem was one of the exciting items on the agenda. Lenin headed the work of the commission on this item. The congress made a detailed and exhaustive study of the development of the struggle for national liberation.

On 26 July 1920 Reed, the American communist, delivered a speech specifically backing the views expressed by Lenin to the second congress delegates on the need to expose violations of equality among nations as practiced in the bourgeois world despite their "democratic" constitutions, and on the unification between the proletarian and the national-liberation movements (see V. I. Lenin, "Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 41, p 165). Displaying a feeling of deep anger, he described the persecution of the blacks in the United States and the Jim Crow racist system. John Reed ended his speech as follows: "The communists must not stand aside from the Negro movement for social and political equality . . ." ("2-Y Kongress Kommunisticheskogo Internatsionala. Stenograficheskiy Otchet" [Second Congress of the Communist International. Shorthand Minutes], Petrograd, 1921, p 132).

Reed wrote a special article entitled "Such Things Are Not Forgotten," on the proceedings of the Second Comintern Congress and its international significance. "This congress," he wrote, "was a unique congress of its kind in the entire history of mankind." Describing the tremendous impression of its decisions on the delegates, Reed noted: "They all . . . left Moscow convinced that the Communist Party is necessary, and that communism can be built only through proletarian dictatorship . . ."

Yet another vivid proof of Reed's activities at the Second Comintern Congress remains. The delegates decided to express their deepest respect for the leader of the world's proletariat in a special album. The first entry read: "Lenin is so simple and humane and, at the same time, so farsighted and inflexible. Lenin is the locomotive engine of history. John Reed. Communist Labor Party (America)" ("Pis'ma V. I. Leninu iz-za Rubezha" [Letters to V. I. Lenin from Abroad], Mysl', Moscow, 1966, p 225).

Developing the decisions of the Second Comintern Congress, the First Congress of the Peoples of the Orient was convened in September 1920. John Reed, member of the Comintern executive committee, was among the delegates to the congress. He was assigned to deliver a speech. "I represent here the revolutionary workers of one of the great imperialist powers--the United States--which exploits and oppresses the peoples of the colonies," said Reed, opening his speech. He then exposed the imperialist nature of U.S. policy in the colonies, and mocked the pharisaic statements on the "selfless" aid provided by the United States to the peoples of the orient. "The Americans promised the Philipinos independence. An independent republic of the Philippines will be proclaimed soon," the speaker said. "However, this is not to say that American capitalists will leave the country or that the Philipinos will not continue to work for their profit . . ." The same situation, the speaker went on to say, prevails in Cuba, the Republics of Haiti, Santo Domingo, Mexico, and other countries. The moment the peoples of these countries rise to the struggle for their national liberation, the U.S. government sends its troops "to maintain order," in fact setting up military dictatorships in these republics. John Reed called upon all nations to be vigilant and not to yield to the provocations of their American "friends" and "liberators."

Calling for greater solidarity between all oppressed and toiling peoples and Soviet Russia, he said: "We are telling you, the peoples of the orient: 'Do not trust the promises of American capitalists!' The path to freedom is only one. Join the Russian workers and peasants who overthrew their capitalists and whose Red Army defeated the foreign imperialists! Follow the Red Star of the Communist International!"

The first Congress of the Peoples of the Orient did a great deal of work to unite the revolutionary forces of the oppressed nations. Reed as well, Lenin's loyal student and follower, deserves credit for this.

In his report "The Great October and the Progress of Mankind," dedicated to the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet chairman, expressed the profound feelings of respect felt by the Soviet people for our foreign comrades in the struggle for the triumph of the ideals of socialism. "These solemn days," he stated, "we gratefully speak of the revolutionary solidarity which our class brothers abroad have invariably displayed toward the Soviet state. Their firm actions have frequently helped to wreck the aggressive intents of imperialism." Firmly taking the side of the working class, John Reed was one of these fighters, a most active communist-internationalist, and passionate propagandist of the great Leninist ideas.

AID TO PROPAGANDISTS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 78 pp 121-122

[Review by E. Bezcherevnykh, candidate of philosophical sciences, of the training aid "Metodika Partiyной Ucheby" [Method for Party Studies], Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 384 pages]

[Text] The mass study of Marxism-Leninism is the most important characteristic of the development of the social consciousness in our country at the present stage. The involvement of ever broader masses of communists and non-party members in political training is considered by the party the most important factor in upgrading the level of all ideological-educational work, for the successes of the building of communism depend most directly on the depth of understanding of problems of Marxist-Leninist theory and party policy, and the level of consciousness and idea-mindedness of the masses.

The requirements of science must be fully consistent with the content, method, and organization of party propaganda. In this case the problem of upgrading the level of methodical training of propagandists becomes very topical. Practical experience has indicated that their weak training is frequently the reason for work failures. That is why the publication of a training aid on the method of party studies must be considered quite timely.

The book is a successful attempt to present the method for party studies as an integral and autonomous subject. Its first section describes the subject and tasks of the course. The second section provides a thorough study of its theoretical foundations, while the third section deals with problems of general and specific methods, describing the various means of methodical work.

The book achieves a certain "encounter" between the general principles governing the structure of training and education activities and the summed up practical experience of the best propagandists. The party training method could be considered a scientific discipline precisely as a result of such an "encounter." Yet, propaganda practice offers frequent examples of one-sided enthusiasm for a simplistically conceived summation of experience and

for a "direct and metaphysical understanding of the interrelationship between theory and practice" (p 89). In such a case, the work states, "the subject of the method is reduced to a reduction of empirical rules determined through trial and error, i.e., through the most labor intensive way, rules whose universality of application in this case can not be rationally substantiated" (p 121).

The merit of the work's authors lies precisely in the fact that they have formulated clearly and precisely the need for a serious study of the theoretical foundations of the method for party studies. The chapters discussing the social functions of propaganda, social psychology, pedagogy, and logic will be of unquestionable use to propaganda workers, among others also in summing up practical experience.

We know that frequently shortcomings in propaganda activities are caused by incomplete work on a number of important method problems. The authors of the aid prove that methodical work is far from always consistent with the conclusions based on the dialectical-materialistic understanding of the cognitive process, the logical structure of thinking, and the profound study of the socio-psychological factors governing human actions.

The authors consider in detail the basic differences between propagandas conducted by the two systems. Great attention is paid to criticism of the so-called manipulative type propaganda characteristic of bourgeois ideological theory and practice. Bourgeois propaganda is presented as the open fraud and falsification of facts and use of suggestion methods developed by advertising specialists and the purpose of unaccustoming people to think independently by supplying them with a ready-made set of stereotypes and cliches.

The Communist Party exerts an essentially different type of influence on social awareness. The content and meaning of Marxist-Leninist propaganda are the orientation toward the development of the creative thinking of the working people, the conscientiousness and activeness of students, and the desire to make use of the entire party training system to mold the creative activity of the masses and their high level consciousness. Consequently, the methods used take into consideration the activeness of the trainee and his function as a "subject rather than passive participant in the process" of training, and the task of consciously mastering theory and converting knowledge into profound personal conviction. This position is based on theoretical and supported by specific elaborations of methodical ways and means. The propagandist will find in the work a great deal of practical advice on how to organize lectures, talks, practical training, and other forms of work with students within the party training system.

Naturally, the work does not lack shortcomings: Many of the concepts expressed are questionable. Thus, the claim of the expediency of the inductive method for the presentation of the material in basic political courses is far from being uncontroversial (p 235). In all cases, psychological-pedagogical studies of the training process, even at the primary level,

indicate that matters are hardly that simple. In this case the authors have obviously ignored the specific nature of an adult audience. The meaning of "one-sided attraction" for an individual approach to education and training and of why such an approach could lead to the upbringing of individualists is not clear (p 99). The work contains repetitions of citations and of some theoretical stipulations (for example, on two separate occasions the authors describe the content of the principles governing the links between propaganda and life and of the scientific nature of propaganda). Obviously, should the book be reprinted the authors should plan more thoroughly the structure of the school aid.

Such shortcomings do not detract from the overall rating of the book. We believe that it will be useful to propagandists and will contribute to further theoretical work in the field of party training methods.

5003

CSO: 1802

ECONOMIC FUNCTIONS OF THE LABOR COLLECTIVE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 78 pp 122-123

[Review by Professor D. Pravdin, doctor of economic sciences, of the book "Kollektiv i Effektivnost' Proizvodstva" [The Collective and Production Effectiveness], by V. M. Kuznetsov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 272 pages]

[Text] Using extensive factual data from leading enterprises, the author describes the place and role of the labor collective in resolving central problems of the mature socialist economy. He focuses his attention on upgrading the quality of labor and output, production intensification, acceleration of the pace of scientific and technical progress, improved production organization, cadre upbringing, and growth of their professional skills. He deals extensively with the development of economic initiative on the part of the collective, based on the improved organization of the socialist competition, more extensive participation of the working people in production management, and the strengthening of organization and labor discipline.

The book discusses the indicators and criteria used in assessing the economic activities of collectives, premises for upgrading the quality of their work, and the economic significance of raising labor and output standards. Quality control, as the author accurately notes, is most closely linked with the intensive use of material production factors, increased capital returns, and economy and thrift.

Under contemporary conditions high quality labor and output are inconceivable without the fast and extensive practical use of scientific and technical achievements. The author describes the role of the production collective in the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, the specific methods for combining science with production, and methods for controlling the formulation of comprehensive scientific and technical programs and promptly mastering the results of scientific research and experimental design projects. The work describes the experience acquired in the field of social planning and socialist competition.

As the author proves with the help of convincing examples, to the working people the labor collective is an effective management school. It is also accurate, however, that if insufficient attention to the systematic upgrading of the economic training of the workers is paid at this level, it would be difficult to rely on a higher activity on their part in the solution of economic problems. The economic and social functions of labor collectives are implemented the more successfully the more fully the specific nature and conditions of their functioning are taken into consideration. It should be pointed out that under developed socialist conditions as well the establishment of labor collectives is not smooth all the way, with no difficulties or constant work with the people. In this connection the author should have paid greater attention to the role of the party and social organizations and economic managers in recreating, uniting and ensuring the effective functioning of collectives. In educational work we must take into consideration not only specific activities but the history of the establishment of collectives, for there are collectives with long great revolutionary and labor traditions as well as collectives which have been organized quite recently. Here there should be no routine in resolving similar production problems.

The collective is not a mechanical human conglomerate. The working people are people of different skills, activeness, interests, and others. Under such circumstances it would be erroneous to idealize individual, even famous, labor collectives, ignoring shortcomings in their work. The elimination of pretentiousness, formalism, and a superficial approach to management decisions, and intensified individualization in educational work are mandatory prerequisites for upgrading the role of labor collectives in the successful solution of economic and social problems at different management levels.

The book makes it possible to clarify more extensively the laws governing the shaping and effective functioning of labor collectives and to upgrade their role in improving the socialist role of life, the molding of the new man and his interests, and upgrading his education, professional training, and spiritual standard.

5003

CSO: 1802

IN THE CENTER OF PRACTICAL POLITICS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 78 pp 123-125

[Review by B. Rakitskiy, doctor of economic sciences, of the book "Sotsializm i Narodnoye Blagosostoyaniye" [Socialism and People's Prosperity], edited by K. I. Mikul'skiy. Joint publication by the following publishing houses: Mysl' (Moscow), Nauka i Iskusstvo (Sofia), Kosut (Budapest), Akadimia (Berlin), State Economic Publishing House (Warsaw), and Pravda (Bratislava), Moscow, 1976, 446 pages]

[Text] The building of developed socialism opens even greater scope for the effect of its laws and the establishment of all its advantages in all realms of social life. Among the most important among them are the conditions, standard, and way of life of the people. It is precisely now that the advantages of the new system in this area are revealed more completely than in the past; at the same time, the objective need for the creative and planned utilization of the gains of socialism in the interests of the further all-round improvement of human life intensifies. These two aspects--the achievements and advantages of socialism and the need for a greater leading role by the Marxist-Leninist parties and socialist states set the tone of this big comprehensive work drafted by a collective of scientists from six fraternal countries.

In this topic related to the increased prosperity and higher living standard of the people, the attention of researchers and propagandists is drawn above all to the dynamics of income and consumption, scale of state appropriations for education, health care, cultural services, fulfillment of housing construction programs, and so on. In the collective work this aspect has been subjected to a vivid and extensive interpretation. The book also offers a variety of rich data showing the specific characteristics of the various aspects of the prosperity of the working people.

The consideration of processes related to improving the life of the people, specific of socialism and inaccessible to the exploiting society, is of particular interest. Here the advantages of the new system are particularly clear in their most complete forms. They include the new socialist way

of life; the social policy of strengthening unity within society and of systematically equalizing the socioeconomic position of classes, strata, and social groups of working people, nations, and nationalities; scientific state programs for social development and for upgrading the living standards of the people; concern shown by the state for the spiritual development of man, and other factors of the practical achievement of socialist social relations. The work discusses such matters most extensively. This places it above the level of strictly economic studies, ascribing a political economic and sociopolitical nature to both studies and conclusions.

The necessity of and possibility for a sharper turn of the economy toward the solution of the various problems of upgrading the people's prosperity was emphasized at the 24th and 25th congresses of the CPSU and a number of recently held congresses by the other fraternal parties of socialist countries. Under mature socialist conditions, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out, it has become possible "to accomplish that which we have always pursued: Making the increased prosperity of the Soviet people the center of the party's practical policy."

The center of practical policy! This formulation of the task requires a decisive energizing of research and broadening the front of studied processes and laws, as well as determining the most essential relations not only on the general scientific level but in terms of specific historical conditions as well. Also important is the consolidation of research forces for the sake of the more fruitful exchange of practical experience acquired by the socialist countries. The present monograph is a successful result of such scientific cooperation. Its author depict both the general laws governing the growth of prosperity under socialism, the characteristics of their contemporary refraction in different countries, and the most important among the possible variants in the solution of problems now considered primary.

The advantage which must be revealed even more clearly under mature socialist conditions is that the new system has an effective mechanism for the conscious implementation of the tasks related to social progress. The authors note that this mechanism is based on the leading role of the working class and the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party whose policy scientifically reflects the requirements of social development. The main topic of the book is that of the social trend of economic growth and the content and methods of social policy. Let us note some of the central aspects of this topic.

First, there is the unity between economic and social policy. Under contemporary conditions this unity intensifies. The need arises to improve the methods supporting it in order to upgrade both the economic and social effectiveness of the economy and other realms of social activity. The course toward upgrading social production effectiveness means that the state is making fuller use of the possibilities for the solution of social problems. The growth of economic effectiveness is not self-seeking and not all means to ensure it are acceptable under socialism. Social objectives are the highest criteria in its economy. "The social effectiveness of economic and

other measures," the authors emphasize, "is determined by the extent to which the implementation of a given measure brings society closer to the building of socialism, to upgrading the level of its maturity, and its further progress toward the higher phase of the communist system. This global criterion of social effectiveness is concretized for each stage of social development" (p 154).

The strict observance of this criterion contributes to the fullest possible and most rational utilization of the economic possibilities of society and the efficient social direction followed in economic management. Since this is consistent with the basic interests of all social groups, they react by displaying profound interest in upgrading economic effectiveness and improving the quality of all work. Establishing the ways and means for the fuller utilization of the advantages of the new system for the good of the people, we can not be restricted to improvements in the economic mechanism alone. The authors properly raise the question of the social mechanism of the utilization of economic laws, the consideration of their requirements, and the improvements of this mechanism.

In our time the unity between the social and economic policy of the socialist state has gained a new form of practical implementation consisting of the social program within the national economic plan. Naturally, this does not lower the outstanding role of social solutions contained in previous plans. However, the scope of the problems, scale of appropriations, and level of intercoordination of social measures have now become essentially different.

Some of the most important components of the social programs in the fraternal countries include the systematic rationalization of the population consumption structure. This topic is among the most aptly presented in the book. The bourgeois ideologues hypocritically raise the following question: Is it ethical to recommend to the people a given consumption structure, not to speak of encouraging them to adopt it? They ignore the powerful system of means of influence through which the monopolies literally force the consumer to obey their will. This includes the artificial encouragement to acquire an ever greater amount of things, the encouragement of pseudo need, advertising, and fashion whose supreme objective is to energize the market. The "consumer market" trap means being the slave of things, pursuit of material wealth, the fetish of conspicuous consumption, and proof of exclusive status.

The socialist state creates the necessary social, ideological, and economic conditions which block the false ways leading to the development of individual consumption. Socialism presents another value system and scale of priorities whose objective to liberate man for the creative and free development of all his capabilities.

The authors cover problems of improving methods for the planned shaping of the progressive structure of consumption. In this case the most important planning instrument is an efficient consumer budget--a system of consumption indicators reflecting contemporary scientific concepts of a qualitative

higher level and structure of needs. This will enable us to look into the future and envisage the basic consumer mass 15 to 20 years from now and, on this basis, already now take measures to prepare the production system and service industry to reach the required parameters. At the same time, the book justifiably describes the inadequacies of this method alone, for it is not merely a question of increasing consumption and the variety of methods for the satisfaction of existing needs. People will develop, their world will be enriched, and their needs will rise. This is the reason for the new complex tasks.

A large number of problems, properly discussed in the book, deal with distribution policy. We know that the main problems in this area have long and reliably been resolved by socialism. However, what makes mature socialism complex is precisely the fact that many of its basic invariable principles change the specific methods of their application. This is most frequently related to the elimination of previously existing objective limitations and difficulties. Under the new conditions greater returns may be yielded by the same capital and the social effect of "human investments" may be increased. Patterns become less mandatory and the policy of the state in the fields of income, services, and housing construction becomes more varied and with greater alternatives. This indicates the possibility for taking fuller into consideration the interests of individuals, social groups, and population strata. Naturally, this also means the possibility to create even more favorable prerequisites for increasing interest in the work and in the growth of social and political activity.

Socialism has achieved universally acknowledged successes in upgrading the people's prosperity. This is one of the reasons for the aggravation of the ideological struggle on the subject of upgrading the living standard. Refined bourgeois propaganda is trying to direct the discussion of problems of consumption, income, and development of services to the channel of "impartial" level of comparisons which would be to its advantage. The work is an apt volley fired against such refinements of the ideological enemy. It poses the problems of the prosperity on the plain of broad historical perspective, the radical advantages of socialism, the legitimacy of its achievements, the dynamism of the formulation and resolution of problems, and the consistency of the socioeconomic policy of communist and workers' parties with the radical interests of the working people. This is the most essential aspect of the book and the reason for its success and value.

5003
CSO: 1802

SHORT BOOK REVIEWS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 78 pp 125-127

[Two book reviews]

[Text] V. I. Novikov, "Lenin i Deyatel'nost' Iskrovskikh Grupp v Rossii (1900-1903 gg)" [Lenin and the Activities of ISKRA Groups in Russia (1900-1903)]. Mysl', Moscow, 1978, 350 pages. Reviewed by Yu. Lebedev, candidate of historical sciences.

The establishment in Russia, in 1900, of ISKRA centers, and networks of agents and correspondents was an organic, a structural part of the Leninist plan of the struggle for a proletarian party of a new type.

V. I. Lenin undertook the implementation of this complex task immediately following his return from Shushenskoye. "He lived in Russia for one full year following his exile," recalled N. K. Krupskaya, "in order to set up strongholds for the future newspaper, ensure the assistance of a number of agents who would organize the receipt and distribution of the newspaper, and secure a number of contributors and correspondents" (N. K. Krupskaya, "O Lenine. Sbornik Statey" [On Lenin. A Collection of Articles], Moscow, 1960, p 97).

Studying the process of the appearance of ISKRA and of ISKRA groups in Russia, P. I. Novikov describes the way Lenin rallied the truly revolutionary forces. The book does not duplicate the extensive published material covering that period. The author considers as his task to cover little known or insufficiently studied aspects of the problem. Interesting observations and valuable facts drawn from archive sources are combined in his work with polemic remarks concerning individual researchers. The author provides a thorough criticism of bourgeois historiography.

At the beginning of 1900, on his way from Shushenskoye to Pskov, Lenin visited Ufa, Moscow, Petersburg and, subsequently, a number of other cities where he acquainted the revolutionary social democrats with his plan for the

creation of a Marxist party. In the subsequent months he took energetic measures for the organization of the first ISKRA groups. In the spring of 1900, under Lenin's direct leadership, specific problems related to training ISKRA assistance groups in Pskov were resolved. P. N. Lepeshinskiy recalls that in June 1900 he met with Lenin in Podol'sk. Lenin gave him "instructions on the organization of the ISKRA group in Pskov and on serving the interests of the organ conceived by Il'ich in the sense of intermediary role which Pskov could play between Petersburg and foreign countries" (p 49). Vladimir Il'ich was no less thorough in setting up an ISKRA center in Ufa. The ISKRA group set up in Poltava was to cover the southern part of the country. Agents of the newspaper appeared in Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev, Baku, and many other cities.

V. I. Lenin defined the range of problems and objectives covering ISKRA personnel activities and means for communicating with the editors in Munich. ISKRA groups, the author notes, established contacts with workers and representatives of the revolutionary-leaning intelligentsia, selected correspondents, gathered facts exposing the arbitrariness of the authorities, collected funds for the publication of the newspaper, delivered it, and extensively participated in the political struggle and the formulation of the party program (see p 9-10).

The author describes extensively each aspect of this difficult and frequently "dirty" work which largely ensured ISKRA's success. The description is vivid and impressive. The experience gained by the ISKRA personnel is of particularly topical interest to the revolutionaries in countries where they must operate under clandestine conditions.

Particularly important among the various activities of the ISKRA personnel were their activities against rightwing opportunism which was reflected, above all, in the views of the economists. "As a result of the victorious struggle against economism," Lenin noted, "the entire bloom of the conscious proletariat took ISKRA's side" (see "Poln Sobr Soch" [Complete Collected Works], Vol 26, p 344).

The descriptions of the struggle waged by the ISKRA personnel against the infamous Zubatov movement and the provocations of Tsarist security are presented in a lively and original manner. "Police socialism," represented a certain danger to the workers' movement. "The Zubatov movement tried to draw the proletariat away from the revolutionary struggle, using opportunistic theories." In October 1900 Zubatov reported the following to the police department: "Today I read a note in RUSSKIYE VEDOMOSTY on Bernstein's book 'Historical Materialism . . .' and my heart fluttered: Here was our ally against the disgraceful Russian social democracy" (p 240).

The ISKRA people firmly exposed the Zubatov movement as the tool of the Tsarist authorities, exposing its social roots, and trying to draw away from police influence the workers who had fallen in the net of the Zubatov organizations. The merits of the newspaper were highly rated by the workers'

movement. For example, the press organ of the Perm RSDWP Committee emphasized that "when the Zubatov movement appeared, ISKRA was the first to expose its nature and it is possible that the Russian social democratic movement did not abandon the true way it had taken only thanks to it" (p 252). The materials presented in the book sound today as well as a warning against numerous bourgeois and imperialist subversions.

The ISKRA personnel played an outstanding role, under Lenin's guidance, in the preparations for the Second RSDWP Congress. As a result of their activities a nucleus of united revolutionary forces appeared--the ISKRA Russian organization. The ideological and organizational principles supported by ISKRA, described in Lenin's work "What Is to Be Done?" were accepted by a considerable number of social democratic organizations and committees. All this strengthened the influence of the ISKRA supporters and, as shown in the book, they most actively participated in the immediate preparations for the congress. The successful activities of the organizational committee, completed with the holding of the congress, the author concludes, became possible only thanks to the tremendous work done by the ISKRA editors, headed by Lenin (see p 313).

The ISKRA personnel honorably fulfilled their assignments. As we know, the Second RSDWP Congress proclaimed ISKRA the party's central organ.

This book, dealing with such an important topic, is quite timely, coming out on the eve of the 75th anniversary of the Second Party Congress. It will be welcomed by the readers with interest.

L. S. Gaponenko, "Reshayushchaya Sila Velikogo Oktyabrya"
[The Decisive Force of the Great October]. Politizdat,
Moscow, 1977, 272 pages. Reviewed A. Utenkov, doctor of
historical sciences.

The Marxian scientific formula according to which "the renaissance of mankind" is in the hands of the working class (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch" [Works], Vol 16, p 336) reveals its importance ever more deeply and emphatically with each new step taken by mankind on the way of social progress.

Among the many class battles waged by the international proletariat the victory of the working class in Russia in October 1917 holds a particular position. Becoming the vanguard of the broad toiling masses, under the guidance of the Leninist party, as Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said in his report "The Great October and the Progress of Mankind," the Russian proletariat "provided an answer to the most urgent and vital political problem: Is the power monopoly of the exploiters eternal or could it and should it be replaced by the power of the working people?"

Today, under the conditions of the steadily expanding world revolutionary process, when huge human masses are becoming involved in the struggle for peace and socialism, the need to sum up and utilize the experience of the

struggle waged by the working class in our country for the victory of the socialist revolution and the building of a developed socialist society is felt with new emphasis, making it possible comprehensively to assist in the "conscious choice of ways, means, and methods of struggle which could yield the greatest and most durable results with the lowest possible outlays of forces" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln Sobr Soch" [Complete Collected Works], Vol 9, p 208).

This is the purpose of the recently published book by L. S. Gaponenko on the role of the USSR working class in the revolutionary reorganization of society. It sums up the historical experience of the Russian proletariat which was destined to be the first to rise for the liberation from capitalist oppression and the overthrow of the domination of the bourgeoisie, and for socialism. Using extensive factual data, the author has described the decisive role of the Russian working class in the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the leading role of the Leninist party in 1917.

Using Leninist methodology and extensive statistical data, the author describes the social aspect of the Russian proletariat at the turn of the century: He analyzes its numerical strength and composition and describes the unity and organization of the main detachments of the hegemonistic class. The facts cited by the author refute the clumsy fabrications of contemporary bourgeois historians who are trying to deny the leading role of the proletariat in the revolution on the "grounds" that, allegedly, it was extremely insignificant in terms of numbers, it was uncultured, and even irresponsible.

The revolutionary creativity of the proletariat following the overthrow of autocracy is studied extensively. As the author emphasizes, the soviets were one of the best forms of political organization of the working class. They were of tremendous importance to the development of the revolution. "Had the popular creativity of the Russian Revolution which had gone through the great experience of 1905 failed to create the soviets as early as February 1917," V. I. Lenin pointed out, "in no case could the soviets been able to seize the power in October, for success depended exclusively on the existence of already ready organizational forms of a movement involving millions of people" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 36, p 6). The author also studies the process of the development of mass trade unions and factory and plant committees, and the formation and activities of Red Guard detachments in which the proletariat was given combat training in the political struggle.

The struggle of the working class for Soviet power, headed by the Bolshevik Party, is described by the author as inseparably linked with the striking movement and the defense by the workers of their economic gains, and their struggle for an eight hour work day and for workers' control over enterprises.

With the help of extensive specific historical data the author proved that the working class is a leading force thanks to the fact that its ideological unification based on Marxist-Leninist principles is strengthened by the material unity of the organization--the Marxist-Leninist party which rallies around the working class millions of working people in a powerful army, the only one capable of achieving a revolutionary reorganization of society on a socialist basis.

FROM THE BOOKSHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 78 pp 127-128

[List of books received]

[Text] "V. I. Lenin, KPSS o Bor'be Kontrrevolyutsiyey" [V. I. Lenin and the CPSU in the Struggle against the Counter-Revolution]. Collection. Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 414 pages.

Brezhnev, L. I., "Aktual'nyye Voprosy Deologicheskoy Raboty KPSS" [Topical Problems of CPSU Ideological Work]. In two volumes. Volume 1, Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 631 pages.

Brezhnev, L. I., "O Dal'neyshem Raxvitii Sel'skogo Khozyaystva SSSR." [On the further Development of USSR Agriculture]. Report delivered at the CPSU Central Committee 3 July 1978 Plenum]. "Postanovleniye Plneuma TsK KPSS, Prinyatoye 4 Iyulye 1978 Goda". [4 July 1978 CPSU Central Committee Plenum decree]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 64 pages.

"Bessmeiten Tvoy Pod' ig, Minsk!" [Minsk, Your Exploit Is Immortal!] Visit by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman to the city-hero of Minsk for the ceremonies on the occasion of the award of the Order of Lenin and the Gold Star Medal to the city on 25 June 1978. Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 54 pages.

"N erushimoye Yedinstvo i druzhba" [Inviolable Unity and Friendship] Visit to Czechoslovakia of the Soviet party-government delegation headed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, 30 May-2 June 1978. Speeches, documents, and materials. Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 80 pages.

"XXV S'yezd KPSS: Yedinstvo Teorii i Praktiki" [The 25th CPSU Congress: Unity of Theory and Practice.] Issue No 3. Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 496 pages.

Gromyko, A. A. "O Prakticheskikh Putyakh k Prekrashcheniyu Gonki Vooruzheniy" [On the Practical Ways for Terminating the Arms Race] Speech at the special session of the United Nations General Assembly on Disarmament, 26 May 1978. Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 32 pages.

Ponomarev, B. N., "Zhivoye i Deystvennoye Ucheniye Marksizma-Leninizma" [The Living and Effective Marxist-Leninist Doctrine]. Answer to critics. Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 95 pages.

Bodyul, I. I., "Sovetskaya Moldaviya" [Soviet Moldavia] ("Republics in the Soviet State" Series). Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 128 pages.

"Bol'shevizm i Reformizm" [Bolshevism and Reformism]. Collective Monograph. Editors: A. F. Kostin, S. V. Kirillov, and S. L. Titarenko. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 384 pages.

Vasil'yev, A., "Trudnyy Pereval" [Difficult Crossing]. Nauka, Moscow, 1977, 304 pages.

"Zarubezhnyye Molodezhnyye Organizatsii" [Foreign Youth Organizations]. Manual. Compiled by A. M. Peslyak and Yu. A. Skokov. Molodaya Gvardiya, Moscow, 1978, 384 pages.

"Ideologicheskaya Rabota Partii i Literatura Razvitogo Sotsializma" [Party Ideological Work and the Literature of Developed Socialism]. Collection of Articles. Editor in chief L. G. Yakimenko. Mysl', Moscow, 1978, 229 pages.

"Istoriya Sotsialisticheskoy Ekonomiki SSSR" [History of the USSR Socialist Economy]. In seven volumes. Editorial board. Editor in chief I. A. Gladkov. Volume three. "Sozdaniye Fundamenta Sotsialisticheskoy Ekonomiki v SSSR. 126-1932 gg." [Laying the Foundations of the Socialist Economy in the USSR. 1926-1932]. Volume four. "Zaversheniye Sotsialisticheskogo Preobrazovaniya Ekonomiki. Pobeda Sotsializma v SSSR. 1933-1937 gg." [Completion of the Socialist Reorganization of the Economy. The Victory of Socialism in the USSR. 1933-1937]. Nauka, Moscow, 1977-1978. Volume three, 535 pages; Volume four, 519 pages.

Kaganova, R. Yu., "Lenin vo Frantsii" [Lenin in France]. December 1908-June 1912. Revolutionary, theoretician, organizer. Second expanded edition. Mysl', Moscow, 1977, 380 pages.

"Komintern i Vostok" [The Comintern and the Orient]. Criticism of criticism. Against falsifying Leninist strategy and tactics in the national-liberation movement. Editor in chief R. A. Ul'yanovskiy. Nauka, Moscow, 1978, 373 pages.

"Krizis Antisovetizma" [The Crisis of Anti-Sovietism]. Editor in chief G. Girginov. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1978, 270 pages. A collective work by scientists from Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, the USSR, and Czechoslovakia (Critique of bourgeois ideology and revisionism).

"Maoizm: Voyennaya Teoriya i Praktika" [Maoism: Military Theory and Practice]. Edited by D. A. Volkogonov and A. V. Antosyak. Voenizdat, Moscow, 1978, 222 pages.

"Massovyye Dvizheniya Sotsial'nogo Protesta v SShA. 70-ye Gody." [Mass Social Protest Movement in the United States in the 1970's]. Editors in chief: I. Ye. Geyevskiy and L. A. Salychev. Nauka, Moscow, 1978, 343 pages.

"Molodezh': Problemy Formirovaniya i Vospitaniya" [Youth: Problems of Molding and Upbringing]. Compiled by V. A. Titov. Molodaya Gvardiya, Moscow, 1978, 255 pages.

Momdzhyan, Kh. N., "Pol' Lafarg i Filosofiya Marksizma" [Paul Lafargue and Marxist Philosophy]. Mysl', Moscow, 1978, 327 pages.

Plekhanov, G. V., "Estetika i Sotsiologiya Iskusstva" [Esthetics and Sociology of Art]. In two volumes. Volumes 1-2. Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1978. Volume one, 631 pages; Volume two 439 pages.

"Politicheskiye Sistemy Sovremennosti" [Contemporary Political Systems]. Editors in chief: F. M. Burlatskiy and V. Ye. Chirkin. Nauka, Moscow, 1978, 253 pages.

Smirnov, I. N. "Materialisticheskaya Dialektika i Sovremennaya Teoriya Evolyutsii" [Dialectical Materialism and the Contemporary Theory of Evolution]. Nauka, Moscow, 1978, 288 pages.

"Sovetskiy Soyuz" [The Soviet Union]. Political-economic reference. Compiled by V. A. Golikov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 368 pages.

Usubaliyev, T. U., "Sovetskiy Kirgizstan" [Soviet Kirgizstan] ("Republics in the Soviet State" Series). Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 120 pages.

"60 Pobednykh Let. 1917-1977" [60 Victorious Years. 1917-1977]. Figures and Facts. Compiled by Ya. A. Ioffe and L. P. Zlomanov. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 192 pages.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1978

5003

CSO: 1802

- END -